1020. m 31.
4

A CRITICAL COMMENTARY

ON

Archbiſhop SECKER's LETTER

TO THE

Right Honourable HORATIO WALPOLE,

CONCERNING

BISHOPS in AMERICA.

——— Meditor eſſe affabilis,
Et bene procedit.———
Paulatim plebem primulùm facio meam.

LONDON:
Printed for E. and C. DILLY, in the Poultry.

M DCC LXX.

A CRITICAL COMMENTARY

ON

Archbishop SECKER'S LETTER

TO

Right Honourable HORATIO WALPOLE

BEFORE we examine the contents of this remarkable Letter to Mr *Walpole*, it will be necessary to consider some circumstances relative to the occasion on which it was written, the time when, and the reason why it was published.

Archbishop *Secker*, being himself a very sincere convert from the religious errors in which he had been educated in the early part of his life, and zealously attached to that system which he afterwards embraced, appears, by many tokens, to have been solicitous to convince those whom he had left, of their dangerous delusions, and to bring as many of them as he could influence, over to the Church in which he himself had found in much satisfaction.

Medicor esse affectus.

Ex bene praecedit.

Paulatim pietem primulam facio meam.

Printed for E. and C. DILLY, in the Poultry.

M DCC LXX.

A CRITICAL COMMENTARY, &c.

BEFORE we examine the contents of this remarkable Letter to Mr *Walpole*, it will be neceſſary to conſider ſome circumſtances relative to the occaſion on which it was written, the time when, and the reaſon why it was publiſhed.

Archbiſhop *Secker*, being himſelf a very ſincere convert from the religious errors in which he had been educated in the early part of his life, and zealouſly attached to that ſyſtem which he afterwards embraced, appears, by many tokens, to have been ſolicitous to convince thoſe whom he had left, of their dangerous deluſions, and to bring as many of them as he could influence, over to the Church in which he himſelf had found ſo much ſatisfaction.

With theſe ſentiments, and in this attachment to them, it is not at all ſurpriſing, that his Grace ſhould be deeply enamoured of this project of

eſtabliſhing Biſhops in our *American* Colonies. By ſome intimations in his ſermon preached before *The Society for the Propagation of the Goſpel in foreign Parts*, February 20, 1741[2], it appears, that the accompliſhment of it had early taken poſſeſſion of his Grace's affections, and from the tenor of his conduct and converſation from that time to the hour of his death, we may ſafely conclude, Mr *Walpole*'s Letter muſt have been a precious morſel to him, as it gave him an opportunity of figuring on his favourite ſubject before a miniſter of ſtate.

Mr *Walpole*'s Letter, we are informed by an Advertiſement prefixed to the Biſhop's, was written in the year 1769, to the late Dr *Sherlock* then Biſhop of *London*. It does not appear that Biſhop *Sherlock* gave any anſwer to it, either by word or writing. Biſhop *Secker* indeed *ſuppoſes*, "that if "my Lord of *London* had ever converſed with "Mr *Walpole* on the ſubject, ſince he received "Mr *Walpole*'s Letter, he had *doubtleſs* ſaid every "thing material by way of reply;" yet nothing of this ſort appears, and as nothing in writing by way of anſwer from Dr *Sherlock* to Mr *Walpole* was known to Dr *Secker* *, the more probable ſuppoſition is, that Biſhop *Sherlock*, convinced by Mr *Walpole*'s Letter of the danger, the folly, or at leaſt of the inexpedience of the project, made no reply at all.

But

* See his Letter, p. 1.

But the moment it is communicated to Dr *Secker*, he eagerly ſeizes the opportunity, and attempts to anſwer the Statesman's objections; very little, one would think, to that Gentleman's ſatisfaction, who from the beginning of the year 1751, to the day of his death, ſeems to have let this Letter lie quietly by him, as other ſchemes might do with other miniſters of ſtate, who ſhould be in no diſpoſition to be amuſed with the viſionary propoſals of weak or deſigning projectors.

But ſince his Grace's executors, in compliance with his *fiat* of *May* 25, 1759, have thought fit to revive this Letter, may we not aſk, What is become of Mr *Walpole*'s Letter to Biſhop *Sherlock*? That Dr *Secker*, and conſequently his executors, had it in their power to publiſh Mr *Walpole*'s Letter, is very probable. If any circumſtances made it either impracticable or improper to publiſh that Letter, candor and common juſtice required, that this anſwer to it ſhould have been ſuppreſſed for the ſame length of time. If the public had any claim upon Archbiſhop *Secker* for his ſentiments concerning *American* Biſhops, they had likewiſe a right to the whole proceſs which drew thoſe ſentiments from him. Mr *Walpole*'s Letter might have objections in it, which Archbiſhop *Secker* did not think proper to touch, and his Grace could not be uninformed, that to publiſh anſwers to treatiſes, which they who ſhould

judge between the parties have no poſſible means of conſulting, has always been a ſtanding and a very reaſonable prejudice againſt the fairneſs and impartiality of the anſwerers.

As Mr *Walpole*'s Letter is thus withheld, we can only conjecture, that it might be occaſioned by ſome previous converſation between himſelf and the Biſhop of *London*, concerning Biſhops in *America*. It is very unlikely Mr *Walpole* ſhould begin the ſubject. Miniſters of ſtate were *then* ſaid to be particularly cautious of giving offence to the Coloniſts, and theſe, they could not but know, had no predilection for Epiſcopacy. The Coloniſts, on the other hand, who were members of the Church of *England*, were more eſpecially within the Biſhop of *London*'s epiſcopal department. It was therefore natural enough for his Lordſhip to propoſe an improvement of *their* religious condition. It was his peculiar buſineſs to remove, as far as he could, all obſtacles to it, and conſequently to anſwer Mr *Walpole*'s Letter. He did not anſwer it. He plainly thought it unneceſſary.

How then came this province to be turned over to the Biſhop of *Oxford*? If we look no farther than the *Advertiſement* before the Pamphlet, there is ſome appearance of a reaſon for it. We are there informed, that Mr *Walpole*'s Letter was communicated to Biſhop *Secker*, by the Biſhop of *London*. And hence it might ſeem, that the

Biſhop

Biſhop of *London*, having either leſs leiſure, or leſs ability, left Mr *Walpole* in the hands of his brother of *Oxford*. But in the very firſt page of this anſwer, Biſhop *Secker* ſays, Mr *Walpole*'s Letter was communicated to him by Mr *Walpole* himſelf, nor does he ſeem to know any thing at all of the Biſhop of *London*'s ſentiments on the ſubject of that Letter. It may therefore be ſurmiſed, that Biſhop *Secker* was ſet to work merely by his own alacrity in ſo good a cauſe.

There is little doubt but the editors of this Letter think themſelves well juſtified in executing his Grace's order for printing it after his death, as well as in taking an early opportunity to do it. And yet, might they not have had a reaſonable apology for demurring to that order at this particular juncture, when any attempt at religious innovations in our Colonies, ſeems to be highly unſeaſonable?

At the 15th page of this Letter, his Grace moves a queſtion, "Whether the appointment "of Biſhops in the Colonies, would not ſtir up "dangerous *uneaſineſſes* abroad or at home?"

There is I think little doubt but that theſe uneaſineſſes had been repreſented to Biſhop *Sherlock*, by Mr *Walpole* (who had very good opportunities of knowing) as the inevitable conſequences of ſuch an appointment.

But whatever of this kind might then be apprehended, Archbiſhop *Secker* lived to ſee *uneaſineſſes* in

in the Colonies of a very different nature from any that were dream't of eighteen years ago, such indeed as might have suggested to him, that nothing could be more unreasonable, than the trying his favourite experiment at a time when every wife and good man, and every well-wisher to the peace and prosperity of his Majesty's government, saw how necessary it was to avoid all occasions of irritating the British Colonists of *America*. His Grace's arguments, in answer to the question abovementioned, whatever weight they might have in 1751, or even in 1759, are lighter than vanity itself, when applied to the state of things in 1768. And whoever perules a tenth part of the pamphlets which have appeared, during the late altercations on Colony subjects, will easily perceive, that the publication of such a Letter as this, in the midst of these jarrings, would be adding fuel to the flame. And yet the written order for the printing of it had laid by his Grace, as appears, from 1759 to the time of his death, without one reflection of the very ill effects it might have when he was gone. And could his executors think of doing any honour to his Grace's prudence, his charity, or his moderation, by exposing to the public his Grace's earnestness for advancing his project, at the hazard of so much confusion as must have attended any attempt to execute it at that time?

Perhaps it may be ſaid, that as our Colony-diſputes did not commence till ſome years after 1769, his Grace, through the importance and multiplicity of other affairs, might forget he had made an order for printing this piece after his death. But this I think will hardly be allowed by thoſe who conſider, what daily occurred in the news-papers, concerning the project of epiſcopizing *America*; or if it might be ſuppoſed that theſe were below his Grace's notice, the exiſtence of ſuch an order could not poſſibly eſcape his memory during his Grace's controverſy with Dr *Mayhew*, in which ſome of the ſame topics are exhibited on the part of his Grace, that we find in this Letter to Mr *Walpole*. And as the ſubject has been kept in public view, more or leſs, to this very time, there cannot be the leaſt doubt but the Archbiſhop was conſcious of this order, as long as he was conſcious of any thing.

However, ſince this Letter muſt be publiſhed, it was not unwiſely done to poſtpone it till after his Grace's deceaſe. How aptly ſoever the contents of it might have come in aid of his Grace's other arguments for *American* Epiſcopacy, he ſaw no doubt the additional impurations it muſt have brought him under, from his petulant reflections upon our domeſtic Diſſenters, not to mention the danger of a more mortifying reproof for throwing a bone of contention when and where the parties concerned were ſufficiently exaſperated without it.

What

What ſhall we ſay for his Grace on this occaſion? Shall we offer the apology that one of his admirers hath ſuggeſted for his intermeddling in the expulſion of the *Oxford* Students? *viz.* "A "body labouring under great infirmities, and a "mind perhaps ſympathiſing with it, and not "poſſeſſing in their full vigour thoſe great "faculties, for which he was once ſo eminently "diſtinguiſhed *."

But if this apology for his Grace is accepted, what muſt be ſaid for the editors of the Letter in queſtion? Muſt not theſe infirmities of body and mind have been more familiarly known to them, than to others who had no particular connections at *Lambeth*? Will his Grace's order ſufficiently excuſe them to the public for a production of this nature, *born* ſo much *out of due time*? It had been ſufficient for their ſcruples on the peremptorineſs of the order, to have *printed* the Letter, and to have withheld the *publication*, till times more favourable to the cauſe it pleads. It is remarkable, that juſt before it was advertiſed, the public prints gave us notice, that our Colony-diſputes were upon the point of being adjuſted to the ſatisfaction of all parties: and this was the more credible, as it was announced by writers who were underſtood to be retained as advocates for

* Structures on Dr *Newcaſtle*'s Anſwer to *Pietas Oxonienſis*, page 37, 38.

for the adminiſtration *. At this critical juncture, could there be any laudable, any excuſable motive for publiſhing theſe papers ſo full fraught with provocation to our Diſſenters at home, as well as their brethren in the Colonies abroad? And will not this inconſiderate deference for his Grace's commands, juſtify the enemies of the Church in a common obſervation, that, provided the dignity and emoluments of the Hierarchy are but maintained, no matter what becomes of the civil intereſt of the community; and will not the editors, as well as the author, come in for their ſhare of this reproach?

Paſs we on from theſe preliminary remarks, to the contents of the Letter.

"The thing propoſed, ſays Dr *Secker*, is, that "two or three perſons ſhould be ordained Biſhops, and ſent into our American Colonies, to "adminiſter Confirmation, and to give Deacon's "and Prieſt's orders to proper candidates; and "exerciſe ſuch juriſdiction over the Clergy of "the Church of *England*, in thoſe parts, as the "late Biſhop of *London*'s Commiſſaries did; or "ſuch as it might be thought proper that any "future Commiſſaries ſhould, if this deſign were "not to take place." *page 2.*

By the alternative in the latter part of this propoſal, it ſhould ſeem, that, "if this deſign were "not

* Particularly by an Eſſayiſt who figured more than once under the name of CREON.

" not to take place, " it might be thought proper to veſt the *future* Commiſſaries of the Biſhop of *London* with larger powers of juriſdiction, than the late Commiſſaries had enjoyed, in order to ſupply the want of Epiſcopal juriſdiction." To what this new juriſdiction of the future Commiſſaries would amount, we are not informed. It is left indefinite. This we may ſafely conclude, that it would *not* be thought proper to limit the juriſdiction of Biſhops to any thing leſs than it may be thought proper the future Commiſſaries ſhould exerciſe; and this might, and probably would be, the full juriſdiction exerciſed by the Biſhops of the mother country. What effect this diſcovery will have, upon ſome other propoſals in this Letter, we ſhall ſee preſently. In the mean time we proceed with the writer of it.

" The queſtions, ſaith Dr *Secker*, which ariſe " on this propoſal, are, Is it a reaſonable pro- " poſal in itſelf? And if it be, are there any " ſuch dangers of its being extended to intro- " duce exorbitant church powers, or of raiſing " uneaſineſſes abroad or at home, as may not- " withſtanding, at leaſt for the preſent, be juſt " objections againſt it (*a*)?"

His Grace ſets out with inſinuating, that, " Mr *Walpole* ſeemed to allow the reaſonableneſs " of the propoſal, abſtractedly conſidered." But as this only *ſeems* to have been the caſe, we cannot

(*a*) Page 2.

not judge under what Abſtraction Mr *Walpole* allowed the reaſonableneſs of the propoſal. This could only be learned from his Letter, to which we have no acceſs.

Dr *Secker* argues for the reaſonableneſs of the propoſal from what belongs to the very nature of Epiſcopal Churches; and concerning this matter, Mr *Walpole* might very widely differ from the Dr. —— Mr *Walpole* might be of opinion, that many things belong to the nature of Epiſcopal Churches, which the Biſhops of *England* do not bring into practice. He might aſk the Biſhop of *London*, Whether the Biſhops of *England* enjoyed any privileges, or exerciſed any juriſdiction, which do *not* belong to the very nature of Epiſcopal Churches? If yea; it ſeems expedient to retrench theſe in the firſt place, as mere uſurpations, ſeeing that no edification can ariſe from the exerciſe of ſuch powers and privileges. If, on the other hand, the *Engliſh* Biſhops exerciſe no juriſdiction which does not belong to the nature of Epiſcopal Churches; and if it is reaſonable to ſend Biſhops to *America*, it muſt be reaſonable to ſend them with the powers and privileges which belong to the very nature of the Churches over which they are intended to preſide. That is to ſay, with the powers and privileges exerciſed and enjoyed by the Biſhops of *England*. But this Dr *Secker* did *not deſire* we ſhould believe. Why was he not then more

explicit

explicit concerning the jurisdiction it might be thought proper the new Bishops should exercise in *America*.

" It belongs, says Dr *Secker*, to the very na-
" ture of Episcopal Churches to have Bishops,
" at proper distances, presiding over them (*b*).
Not only that, but it belongs to the nature of Episcopal Churches to have Bishops at *certain* distances, that is to say, within certain districts called Dioceses, presiding over them, and consequently residing among them. For it must be remembered, that there are certain things belonging to the nature of the Episcopal *Office*, as well as to the nature of Episcopal *Churches*, one of which is *vigilance* over the flock of which the Bishop takes the charge; which cannot be exercised while he is absent from them, either in *England* or *America*: and this is equally true, whether the Bishop is distant some hundreds, or some thousands of miles from his Diocese. And yet we know the inhabitants of some of our Dioceses, are, in this respect, no better accommodated than the inhabitants of *America*, for three parts of the year out of four.

If it should be said, *English* Bishops can perform the necessary acts of vigilance by their officers stationed in the Dioceses, even so may the Bishop of *London* by his Commissaries stationed in *America*.

But,

(*b*) Page 3.

"But it is alledged, that there are Episcopal "Acts which must be performed by Episcopal "person," and of these the first instance is that of *Confirmation*.

Shall we then lay it down for a rule, that it belongs to the nature of Episcopal Churches, that all their members should be *confirmed*? If it does not, the Colonists may do without it. And that it does not, appears from the practice, and indeed from the constitution of the Church of *England*. In several Dioceses there are no Confirmations for several years. When Confirmation is administered, it is to children or young persons, from the age of thirteen to sixteen inclusive.

By Canon CXII. if persons of the age of sixteen do not communicate, they are to be presented to the Archbishop, by the Ministers, Churchwardens, &c. In consequence of this Canon, thousands receive the Communion who were never Confirmed, because they never had an opportunity. And when such communicants present themselves for Confirmation, they are told, it is not proper, after they have communicated; which shews, that how *useful* soever Confirmation may be, where it *can* be had, where it *cannot*, it is, by the constitution of the Church of *England* herself, *unnecessary*. And after this, would it be sufficiently respectful to my Lords the Bishops, or indeed to our *excellent* establish-

ment

ment to say, that such and such people, of *Cumberland* for instance, or *Northumberland*, or the *Welch* Counties, are denied Confirmation, unless they will go to *London* for it? or that they are in effect *prohibited* the exercise of one part of their religion (c)?

With respect to Ordination, there are two expedients in use at present for furnishing the Colonists of the Church of *England* with Ministers of their own Communion; 1. By ordaining natives of *America* who come to *England* for that purpose. 2. By sending *English* Ministers to the Colonies from hence.

As to the first of these, Dr *Secker* observes, that "sending their sons to so distant a climate must "be very inconvenient and disagreeable, and tak-"ing the small-pox here is said to be peculiarly "fatal to them," *i. e.* peculiarly to the persons who come here for Orders. For when his Grace mentions a little below, that, "their young men "of fashion would still come to *England* for polite "accomplishments," no apprehensions of what would be inconvenient or disagreeable to *them*, are expressed, nor any mention made of any *peculiar* fatality of the small-pox to such young men.

"The expence also, says his Grace, must be "grievous to persons of small fortunes, such as "most are who breed up their children for Or-"ders; and yet not sufficient to bring any acces-sion

(c) Letter, page 3.

"ſion of wealth to this Nation that would be "worth naming, were more of that rank to "come." (*d*)

From the caſt of this anſwer, one may conjecture, that Mr *Walpole* had objected to *American* Biſhops, that ſuch a meaſure would prevent the Coloniſts from coming hither, and ſpending their money among us. To obviate this, his Grace was obliged to ſuppoſe, that none would ſend their Sons to *England* to be ordained, but perſons in mean circumſtances. But I am inclined to believe that the Statesman's objection would ſtrike a little deeper, and that the conſideration with him might be, that the more inducements the Coloniſts in general ſhould have to ſtay at home, and the fewer occaſions of perſonal intercourſe with the mother country, the more they would aſpire to independency; a matter of very ſerious Conſideration among the Miniſters of thoſe times *.

The Statesman, no doubt, argued, that if the Coloniſts of the Church of *England* were impow-

(*d*) Letter, page 4.

* I have been informed, that the late Archbiſhop of —, being in conference with an eminent Coloniſt, deſired to know of him, if his countrymen would be averſe to the ſending a Biſhop among them? *Pray, my Lord,* ſaid the Gentleman, "are Biſhops made another?" Undoubtedly, *replied* his Grace. *Why then, my Lord,* rejoined the Coloniſt, *you may ſend your Biſhop as ſoon as you pleaſe, it will be one conſiderable ſtep towards our living without you.* Here the converſation was dropped.

ered to manufacture Deacons and Priests for themselves, as well as other things, which they have hitherto imported from hence, they would in time have a Church independent upon that in the mother country; a consideration of ten times more importance to Mr *Walpole*, than the money that would be gained by a few young Men coming to *England* for Orders, or that would be lost by their staying away.

2. With respect to the Clergymen of the Church of *England* who are sent from hence, it must be a matter of great Concern to all who wish well to the interests and credit of the establishment, to be told by an Archbishop of *Canterbury*, that few of them, in proportion, "can answer the end for "which they are designed (*e*)." That the rest are "men of desperate fortunes, low qualifications, "bad and doubtful characters, and a great part "of them *Scotch* Jacobites." Is this for the honour of the Society which sends them? How greatly does this representation detract from the credibility of those accounts they give us from time to time, of the success of their labours in our Plantations; which depend, in a great measure, on the veracity of men of these wretched Characters? When the public is solicited, as is often the case, to supply the deficiency of the Society's funds, by their charitable contributions, will they not be

(*e*) Page 4.

be apt to conſider, before they give their money, upon what ſort of Men it is to be expended?

And how would the matter be mended by ſending Biſhops inſtead of Prieſts? Every conſideration drawn from the nature of the ſervice, the danger of the voyage, abſence from family-connexions, &c. which at preſent ſerves to diſcourage private Clergymen of eaſy fortunes, good learning, ſound principles, and reſpectable characters, would operate with equal force upon the mind of a deſtined Biſhop, and create the ſame reluctance that other men have ſhewn to engage in ſuch an adventure.

Would his Grace have ſaid in anſwer to this, that a larger ſtipend, an increaſe of power, and a more reſpectable title, would have engaged more reputable candidates? I am afraid this would be only ſaying, that ambition and avarice are more reputable motives for accepting the office of a chriſtian Biſhop, than the proſpect of a bare maintenance is for taking the province of an ordinary teacher. His Grace could hardly think that the Coloniſts are ſo much ſtrangers to human nature, as not to be aware, that theſe diſpoſitions are common to Clergymen and others, both of higher and lower ranks; and that, with reſpect to Biſhops ſent from *England* to *America*, the ſame hazards muſt be run by the ſenders, to which the propagating Society is liable in diſpatching common Miſſionaries. So that all the good things his Grace augurates from the appointment of Colony-Biſhops

would effectually be fruſtrated, if the Biſhops were no better men (a point his Grace could by no means inſure to the Coloniſts) than the Miſſionaries he ſpeaks of.

His Grace propoſes great benefit, and conſiderable reformation among both the conforming Clergy and Laity in our Colonies, by ſubſtituting natives for their ordinary Paſtors, inſtead of *vagabond ſtrangers*, (as he calls the Miſſionaries ſent from *England*.) But if native Miniſters would ſo much improve the religious ſtate of our Church of *England* Coloniſts, why not native Biſhops? I aſk this queſtion, becauſe it appears to me, that his Grace never dreamt of ſupplying the mortality of Colony Biſhops, otherwiſe than by recruits from *England*. Probably his grand point could not be gained any other way. Otherwiſe a native of ſome of the Colonies, not liable to the fatality of the ſmall-pox, or to much inconvenience of another ſort, might come over and be conſecrated once for all in *England*. Or an *Engliſh* or an *Iriſh* Biſhop might be found without much difficulty, who would undertake the voyage, without the mortifying alternative of bidding a final adieu to his European connexions, and, having conſecrated one or more proper perſons from among the natives, might return home, and leave the Coloniſts to improve their religious ſtate upon this new inſtitution, as they found occaſion. Here indeed would be *additional encouragement* to parents to breed their children

to the Church, — still more *convenient opportunities* of providing for them handsomely, and even to build and endow, not only Churches and parsonage houses, but Cathedrals and Bishops palaces, in which good works they would hardly shew so much alacrity, if they found the honour, emolument, and power appropriated to Bishops sent in succession from *England*.

And what, I desire to know, would hinder a Bishop sent from *England* from appearing to the Colonists in the light of a *vagabond stranger*, any more than a common Missionary? And would he be more likely, with this *stigma* upon him, to answer any of the good ends proposed by his Grace, more effectually than any other Clergyman of the same country? And this being the case, all that is proposed by his Grace in sending Bishops from hence, is a mere empty chimerical vision, which deserves not the least regard.

Mr *Walpole* must have been a weak politician indeed, if he did not see that Bishops sent from *England* would increase the evils complained of, rather than remedy them. He must have been sensible, or if he was not, we may be at this hour, that the Colonists, were they inclined to admit a prelatical Hierarchy among them (which he very well knew none of them were) would never be satisfied without having the whole ordering of it themselves, any more than they chuse to be controled in some other things. And least of all

would they submit to be governed by *English* Bishops.

One of the blessed effects of the reformation proposed by his Grace (in my opinion the principal one in his estimation) was the conversion of the Dissenters. Accordingly, he strains every nerve to magnify the advantages of this event to the public, in a political view.

"If, saith his Grace, by reforming them (the "Colonists of the Church of *England*) and introducing better order into the Churches of "our communion, more of the inhabitants should "come over to it, *as they naturally will*, this "would be a further public benefit. For the "members of the Church of *England* will think "themselves more connected with *England*, than "others *."

Have then the non-conforming Colonists no dissenting brethren, no kindred, no commercial interests, no King in *England?* Have they less connection, or fewer attachments to *England*, on these and other accounts, than the conformists themselves?

* Page 5. I have good grounds for affirming, that the Conformists in the Colonies in general, so far from being *more* inclined to keep up their connections with the mother country, never did so much by a thousand times, for the sake of it, as the Dissenters ever did, before, and for years after this Letter was written. This however is not meant to exclude some particular public-spirited Conformists. Who they were, and of what communion, who were chiefly instrumental in the late misunderstandings between the Colonies and the mother country, I have no inclination to inquire.

themſelves? If this had been inſinuated by a leſs venerable character than that of an Archbiſhop, I ſhould have been tempted to ſay, that the man muſt either be contemptible for his ignorance, or of an abandoned aſſurance, who ſhould venture ſuch a ſuggeſtion among thoſe who know the truth of the caſe.

His Grace goes on. "And ſuppoſing them not to be *Jacobites*, their acknowledgment of the King's ſupremacy, will incline them to be dutifuller ſubjects than the Diſſenters, who do do not acknowledge it." (g)

Suppoſing them not to be Jacobites! whom does he mean? plainly the converts from among the Diſſenters. But whoever accuſed the Non conformiſts in the Colonies of *Jacobitiſm*, even any one man among them? There is therefore not the leaſt colour for this ſuppoſition, unleſs we ſuppoſe that theſe converts become *Jacobites* as ſoon as they become Conformiſts; which is no very deſirable effect of the Epiſcopal reformation here held forth.

On another hand, his Grace has more than ſuppoſed that moſt of the *Scotch* miſſionaries are *Jacobites*. But every one knows that all theſe, to be duly qualified for their office, muſt acknowledge the King's ſupremacy upon oath: a plain proof that the greater or leſs dutifulneſs of

(g) Page 6.

the ſubject does not depend upon ſuch acknowledgment.

But, "the Diſſenters do not acknowledge the "King's ſupremacy." I am confident that this is a mere malevolent miſrepreſentation, and that there is not one Diſſenter in the Colonies, who denies the King to be his ſupreme Governor; and I am perſuaded the ſame may be ſaid for every proteſtant Diſſenter in *Great Britain*.

The true caſe is this. The proteſtant Diſſenters hold, that the civil magiſtrate hath no authority to interfere in matters of religion, which do not affect the ſafety of his government, ſo far as the private judgment or conſcience of his ſubjects is concerned, whether conſidered as individuals, or united in religious ſociety; and this they hold, not merely with reſpect to the authority of a King or a Monarch as ſuch, but of the aggregate power of legiſlature however conſtituted. And is this principle peculiar to Diſſenters? Has it not been, is it not ſtill the principle of as wiſe, learned, and worthy Conformiſts as ever exiſted? Was it not the principle of *Locke*, *Burnet*, *Clark*, *Hoadley*, and others of the laſt generation? And had the Kings or Queens of thoſe times when theſe men flouriſhed, *dutifull* ſubjects (to uſe his Grace's elegant language) than theſe illuſtrious perſons in the Kingdom? Does not the artificial author of the *Alliance in Church and State*, inform us, that this was

the

the principle on which the Toleration Act was grounded? And would his Grace himself have ventured to say, had he been catechiſed on this head, that it was *not* his own principle too?

I ask his pardon, I did not think of a paſſage in this Letter, *page* 13. where his Grace believes, "his Majeſty hath not a right to order the Biſhop of *London* to recall his Commiſſaries." And if ſo, the ſupremacy, according to his Grace's creed, muſt, in this inſtance, be in the Biſhop of *London*, and not in the King.

For the reſt, if it was ever underſtood that the proteſtant Diſſenters denied the King's ſupremacy, as oppoſed to the ſupremacy of the Pope, or of any foreign Potentate, it is more than I ever heard. In the mean time, it is well known, that the Diſſenters ſcruple not to put themſelves under the protection of the law, as their *dernier reſort*, whenever they apprehend their rights, even as a religious ſociety, to be infringed, or attempted, as was lately notorious in the caſe of a Diſſenter named to the office of Sheriff of *London*, which received its deciſion in the *ſupreme* court of judicature of *Great Britain*.

2. We are now come to the ſecond queſtion, namely, "Whether the danger of increaſing the Church power, by the means of eſtabliſhing Biſhops in *America*, is not a ſufficient objection againſt the project?"

In

In the outſet of his Letter, his Grace talks of "juriſdiction over the Clergy, not only ſuch as "the late Biſhop of *London*'s Commiſſaries *did* "exerciſe, but ſuch as it might be thought "proper future Commiſſaries *ſhould* exerciſe, if "this deſign of epiſcopiſing, ſhould not take "place." An inſinuation that is utterly inconſiſtent with his Grace's declaration, that, "*confirming* and *ordaining* are the only *new* powers "that *will* be exerciſed (*b*)." Theſe powers of confirming and ordaining, the Commiſſaries never had; nor, tenacious as our Prelates have always been of reſerving theſe powers to themſelves, is it probable they will ever conſent that future Commiſſaries ſhould be inveſted with them. The juriſdiction, therefore, that it may be thought proper theſe future Commiſſaries *ſhould* exerciſe, muſt ſignify that enlargement of Church power on which the objection is founded. And as this *enlargement* is intended as a *ſuccedaneum*, in the room of Epiſcopal power, few people will be perſuaded it will be leſs obnoxious in the hands of Biſhops, than it would be in the hands of Commiſſaries.

His Grace, therefore, may much more ſafely be believed, when he ſays, that, "ſtrictly ſpeaking, it can never be promiſed, *in any caſe*, that "no additional powers ſhall hereafter be propoſed "and preſſed on the Colonies," than when he ſays,

(*b*) Page 6.

ſays, "no other jurisdiction is *deſired* for the "propoſed Biſhops, than the preceding Com-"miſſaries have enjoyed."

And yet I know not whether we may not ſafely take his Grace's word, even for this laſt particular. *Right* and *Title*, are very different things from actual *enjoyment*; and if the Colonists may be believed, theſe ſame Commiſſaries have both enjoyed and exerciſed pretended powers of juriſdiction, highly injurious and oppreſſive to the inhabitants, without any *apparent* authority for it.

And of this his Grace ſeems to have been conſcious; elſe why ſhould his Grace have added, "and even that" [the jurisdiction enjoyed by former Commiſſaries] "on this occaſion, may "be aſcertained and limited, *more accurately*, *if* "*it be requiſite* (*i*)." But will it ever be *thought* requiſite, by thoſe who think as his Grace did, that the juriſdiction of a Biſhop ſhould be *aſcertained* or *limited* to any mark below that at which the juriſdiction of a Commiſſary hath been *enjoyed*? And indeed, does not this gracious conceſſion ſeem to imply that the juriſdiction which theſe Commiſſaries have enjoyed, was in fact, *unaſcertained* and *unlimited*?

His Grace ſuppoſes, "it would have been equally right to have oppoſed the Toleration Act, on the apprehenſion, that more, in conſequence of this conceſſion,

(*i*) Page 6.

conceſſion, might have been preſſed upon the government in favour of the Diſſenters, as to oppoſe the ſettlement of Biſhops in *America*, from a preſumption of increaſing the power of the Church (*k*)."

But, I conceive, the caſes are widely different. Whatever is preſſed upon government in favour of the Diſſenters, will always be ſubject to the control of Parliament. Whereas his Grace tells us, *page* 21. "There ſeems no neceſſity that "this affair" [of eſtabliſhing American Biſhops] "ſhould ever come into Parliament." The Biſhops, according to his Grace, "would be ap-"pointed by the Crown, and will be ſuch perſons "as the Crown can beſt confide in." *page* 13. This looks as if the Crown was to have an intereſt in theſe Biſhops, diſtinct from the intereſt of the public; and ſhould it appear in proceſs of time that the limited powers with which theſe Biſhops ſhould be ſent out at the firſt, would be inſufficient for the *political* purpoſes of the Crown, can it be doubted but that they would be immediately enlarged? And can any man ſuppoſe that pretences for it would not be furniſhed by our Biſhops (the only ſolicitors of the project that the Letter points out) *viz.* "that it would be a diſparagement of the Order, to have Biſhops in any part of his Majeſty's dominions, veſted with leſs power than the Biſhops of the mother country.

(*k*) Page 7.

country. — That it belonged to the nature of Episcopal Churches, that their Bishops should have full powers to correct the transgressions as well of the Laity as the Clergy; and that without these powers in their Bishops, the conforming Colonists would not have the full exercise of their religion;" would not these pleas be full as forceable for enlarging those powers, as they are now for appointing the Bishops themselves? *Forceable*, I mean to the Crown, whose particular confidants these American Bishops are to be. And what or who would there be to say nay to the proposal, the Crown having the *power*, and the Bishops the *will*, to have it carried into execution.

But had his Grace reflected ever so little upon what passed in Parliament before the Toleration Act was obtained for the Dissenters, his Grace might have easily perceived, that it was the utmost that could be obtained for them; and that King *William* never could prevail to have them brought into civil offices, but under the restrictions of the Test Act; and that the very order of men, who would, as the case above is stated by his Grace, have so much influence towards enlarging the power of American Bishops, have hitherto had sufficient interest to prevent any farther favours, particularly, *any thing hurtful to the established Church*, from being conferred on the Dissenters.

His Grace however assures us, that no such thing is intended as pressing for *additional* powers

to

to *American* Biſhops; and in this aſſertion he thinks there are no grounds to queſtion the *ſincerity* of his Grace and his brethren.

But on this head of *ſincerity*, I think it was as much as could be reaſonably expected of his Grace, to anſwer for himſelf; for aſſuredly he could offer no ſatisfactory proof that others of his brethren might not intend, what he did not; and about the time when he thus undertook to anſwer for them, it is certain there were Biſhops who were "thought to be peculiarly fond of Church-power," and who when "they were called upon to anſwer for themſelves," gave very little ſatisfaction by their *defences*.

His Grace's great argument for this *ſincerity* is, the *moderation* of his contemporaries. To which I ſhall ſay nothing, but that his Grace was probably the moſt improper perſon of them all, to offer this conſideration on the behalf of his brethren.

What his Grace's *moderation* was, while he was Biſhop of *Oxford*, I leave to be determined by thoſe who were then under his government; what it was when he came to be the Head of his Order, the following admonition, intended for his brethren in convocation 1761, will ſufficiently ſhew.

SEMPER ENITENDUM EST UT ANTIQUI REGIMINIS non modo retineamus formam, SED ET VIM INSTAUREMUS, quatenus vel DIVINO VEL HUMANO

HUMANO JURE FULCITUR, Atque INTERIM, MANCA quodammodo et MUTILA esse nostra (*l*).

That is to say, *We must always* STRIVE, *not only to retain the form, but to* RENEW THE FORCE *of the* ANCIENT CHURCH-GOVERNMENT, *so far as it is* PROPPED UP *either by* DIVINE *or* HUMAN AUTHORITY. *And till that be done, our* POLITY *will be* LAME *and* DEFECTIVE.

Now what was this ancient Church-government? Even the model left us by some of his Grace's Predecessors and their adherents, who never wanted *props* for it (if you would take their interpretations of scripture) either from *divine* or human authority. And the *force* of it consisted, in putting *a two-edged sword into the hands of* Church-Governors, *to execute vengeance upon the heathen, and punishments upon the people* *. In plain English, power to correct Heretics, Schismatics, and Dissenters, with the wholesome severities of whips, pillories, fines and imprisonment.

Without this *force*, it seems our present ecclesiastical Polity is mutilated and lame; and it is, in his Grace's opinion, not only *right* to have this force

(*l*) *Oratio Synodalis*, at the end of his Grace's Charges, *page* 360.

* See Psalm xlix. 6, 7. To which Archbishop *Laud* prefixed this title. *The Prophet exhorteth to praise God for his love to the Church: and for that power which he hath given to the Church, to rule the consciences of men.*

force *renewed*, but abſolutely the duty of the members of the convocation, to *ſtrive* to have it renewed.

"Is this the ſame man," may ſome people ſay, "who ſeems in his Letter to Mr *Walpole*, to be "ſo well contented with the ſhare of power enjoyed by the preſent Biſhops, and who would "have been ſatisfied with much leſs, if he had "lived where much leſs had been allotted to Biſhops? Is this the man who ſtands forth to aſſure the public, that he and his Brethren are "not ſo fond of Church Power, as to be aiming "at that point now, while they ſolemnly profeſs "they are not (*m*)?"

For my part, I can ſee but little room we can make for the virtue of *ſincerity* here. In the *Letter* his Grace aſſures us, with a ſolemn face and a ſmooth tongue, that nothing more is required for theſe *American* Biſhops, than commiſſarial juriſdiction, and authority to *confirm* and ordain. In the *oration*, the ancient Church-government is to be contended for at all events; and without the *force* of it, the Epiſcopal Powers muſt be lame and mutilated. Muſt we not argue thus? this ancient regimen either belongs to the nature of Epiſcopal Churches, or it does not. If it does not, his Grace is exhorting the Convocation to ſtrive for *ſupporting* the *form*, and *reinſtating* the *force* of an ancient uſurpation. If it does, the ſame pretence which ſerves

(*m*) Page 8, 9.

ſerves for a colour to ſtation Biſhops in *America*, will ſerve for a pretence to claim for them the *form* and *force* of the ancient government, namely, the pretence that it belongs to the nature of Epiſcopal Churches. And this, I ſhould think, amounts to ſomething more than a *poſſibility*, that an improper uſe may hereafter be attempted to be made of the appointment of Biſhops for *America*. Once more, what ſhall we ſay for his Grace's *ſincerity* and his *moderation*? theſe two publications are coeval, and by the time and manner of their appearance, ſhould ſeem between them to exhibit his Grace's dying ſentiments.

But the *moderation* and *ſincerity*, concerning which, in examining his Grace's portions of them, we are left in ſo much uncertainty, we may perhaps find in his Grace's coadjutors in this project, with more preciſion. It ſometimes happens that men not worth ſixpence, will offer their bond for great ſums, on the behalf of others who are very well able to pay without them.

"Archbiſhop *Teniſon*," ſays his Grace, "who "was ſurely no high Churchman, left £1000 to- "wards the Eſtabliſhment of Biſhops in *Ameri-* "*ca*(*n*)."

His Grace, I am afraid, is a little unlucky in his inſtance; I am in ſome doubt whether Archbiſhop *Teniſon*'s ſincerity in this bequeſt, is altogether conſiſtent with Archbiſhop *Secker*'s in this pamphlet. But let the reader determine.

(*n*) Page 9.

In Archbiſhop *Teniſon*'s Will, executed *April* 11th, 1715, five hundred pounds were bequeathed to the Society for Propagating the Goſpel in foreign Parts, "for the purchaſing one or more perpe-"tual advowſons, donations, right of patronage "and preſentation of, in, and to one or more vi-"carages or rectories, and to preſent thereto from "time to time, as often as the ſame ſhall become "void, one or more of the moſt deſerving Miſ-"ſionaries of the province of *Canterbury*."

But by a codicil, executed *Dec.* 2. 1715, his Grace revokes and declares this bequeſt null and void, and in the room of it ſubſtitutes what follows,

"But my preſent Will is, that my executors, "their adminiſtrators or aſſigns, do well and tru-"ly pay to the ſaid Society, within one month, "or two at the fartheſt, after the appointment and "conſecration by lawful authority of two Proteſ-"tant Biſhops, one for the Continent, another for "the iſles in *North America*, the ſum of one thou-"ſand pounds, to be applied in equal portions to "the ſettlement of ſuch Biſhops in the fore-men-"tioned Sees. *Until ſuch lawful appointment and* "*conſecrations are compleated, I am very ſenſible* "*(as many of my brethren of that Society alſo are)* "*that as there has not hitherto been, notwithſtand-*"*ing much importunity and many promiſes to the* "*contrary, ſo there never will or can be any regular* "*Church diſcipline in thoſe parts, or any confirma-*

"*tions*

" *tions or due ordinations, or any ſetting apart in* " *eccleſiaſtical manner, of any public places for the* " *more decent Worſhip of God, or any timely pre-* " *venting or abating of factions and diviſions, which* " *have been and are at preſent very riſe; no eccle-* " *ſiaſtically legal diſcipline or corrections of ſcanda-* " *lous manners, either in the Clergy or Laity, or* " *ſynodical aſſemblies, as may be a proper means to* " *regulate eccleſiaſtical proceedings.* In the mean " time, *till ſuch appointment and conſecration as* " *abovesaid is compleated*, my Will is, that my " executors do not pay the ſaid thouſand pounds, " or any part or portion of it, or any intereſt for " the whole or any part of it to the ſaid Society, " but as they have opportunity, to put out the " ſaid ſum or part of it to intereſt upon ſure pub- " lic funds, and to apply ſuch intereſt to the bene- " fit of ſuch Miſſionaries, being Engliſhmen, and " of the province of *Canterbury*, as they ſhall " find upon good information, to have taken true " pains in the reſpective places which have been " committed by the ſaid Society to their care, in " the ſaid foreign Plantations, and have been by " unavoidable accidents, ſickneſs or other infir- " mities of the body, or old age, diſabled from " the performance of their duties in the ſaid places " or precincts, and forced to return to *England*."

Such is the bequeſt of Archbiſhop *Tenniſon*, in which we may obſerve a very different plan of *American* Epiſcopacy from that delineated by his

ſucceſſor, Dr *Secker*, in this Letter. We have here the whole Hierarchical apparatus of Engliſh Epiſcopacy enumerated in the minuteſt manner. *Regular Church diſcipline.—Conſecration of Churches.—Prevention of factions and diviſions*, (meaning, I ſuppoſe, proviſions for uniformity)—*Due Ordinations* (which the Coloniſts are ſuppoſed to want, for it ſeems till a Biſhop is appointed there *never will be* any ſuch)—*eccleſiaſtically-legal corrections both of the Clergy and Laity.* And to crown all, *Synodical aſſemblies to regulate eccleſiaſtical proceedings.*

From the tenor of this codicil, and particularly from the words, *in the mean time, till ſuch appointment and conſecration as aboveſaid is compleated*, it is clear, that till this ſyſtem of Prelatical juriſdiction is *ſettled* in *North America*, both on the continent and in the iſles, the executors of Archbiſhop *Teniſon*, their adminiſtrators, or aſſigns, will not be obliged to pay a ſingle ſixpence of the thouſand pounds to the propagating Society; for that ſettlement is plainly *the conſideration* for which the legacy is left; conſequently, it cannot be applied to the maintenance of Biſhops with the limited, and no more than commiſſarial juriſdiction, for which Dr *Secker* pleads.

It cannot in the leaſt be doubted, but his late Grace of *Canterbury* was well acquainted with the contents of this codicil, ſo far as it related to the appointment of *American* Biſhops. Why then did

did he content himſelf with this general mention of the legacy, and ſuppreſs the conditions of it? Plainly for too very obvious reaſons.

1. Leſt Mr *Walpole* ſhould ſuſpect his Lordſhip's *ſincerity* in affecting to *deſire* no more power for *American* Biſhops, than he ſeems to plead for in this Letter. Mr *Walpole* would be certain that Dr *Secker*, in caſe he carried his point for *American* Biſhops, would not conſent to give up this Legacy of Archbiſhop *Teniſon*; and he would naturally conclude, that upon the event of appointing ſuch Biſhops, Dr *Secker*, as a man of ſenſe, and a man of politics, would make the preſervation of the legacy, an argument for granting the additional juriſdiction deſcribed in the codicil.

2. The particulars enumerated in the codicil, are utterly inconſiſtent with the character of *no high Church-man*, for which he would recommend the example of Archbiſhop *Teniſon*. The exhibition of them would indeed have made a farther diſcovery, equally unfavourable to the views and principles of *many of* Dr Teniſon's *brethren of the Society*, who are repreſented as equally *ſenſible* with his Grace, that all theſe Eccleſiaſtical *neceſſaries* would follow the appointment of Biſhops, and could not be had without it; and conſequently would quite ſpoil Dr *Secker*'s argument drawn from the "univerſal deſire of his brethren, and of the "members of the Society, as well Laymen as "Clergymen, of eſtabliſhing Colony Biſhops,

"*from the Revolution to this day*," and induce a ſuſpicion that the converſion of the Indians was but a blind, a mere pretence of the high church men, to obtain a charter for the noble purpoſe of eſtabliſhing Biſhops. For his Grace expreſly tells us, that, "this whole body of men, almoſt ever "ſince it was in being, hath been making re-"peated applications for Biſhops in *America* (o)." Behold then the cloven foot which his Grace, no doubt, thought was ſufficiently covered by this general reference to Archbiſhop *Tenniſon*'s legacy, as he might be pretty ſure Mr *Walpole* would hardly go to the Commons to conſult the original.

I am however perſuaded, that there have been, and ſtill are numbers of that reſpectable Society, who fall not under his Grace's crude repreſentation. I could, if it was proper, point out ſome moſt worthy men, whoſe names were not long ago upon the liſt, who thought no better of the epiſcopizing project than Mr *Walpole*, and particularly as deſcribed in Archbiſhop *Tenniſon*'s codicil. But the artifice was plauſible to bring the whole body into the ſame predicament, with a man of Archbiſhop *Tenniſon*'s Moderation (for ſuch that worthy Prelate really was) at their head.

But if a man of moderation, how ſhall we account for this ſcheme of Epiſcopal diſcipline eſpouſed in his codicil, and on which the good old man lays ſo much ſtreſs? could he be ignorant that it was

(o) Page 9.

was the exerciſe of the ſame powers from which the original Coloniſts of *America* fled into the wilderneſs? On the other hand it may be aſked, could this be the ſame man, who in the year 1689, pleaded for admitting the diſſenting Clergy into the Church without reordination by Biſhops? Could this be the ſame man, who had experienced ſo ſeverely in 1700, how improper Synodical aſſemblies were to regulate eccleſiaſtical proceedings, or to prevent and abate factions and diviſions (p)?

The truth is, this codicil was executed but twelve days before the Archbiſhop's death, when the powers of judgment and reflection may well be ſuppoſed to have been greatly impaired. His Grace was then in the eighty-fifth year of his age, worn out with the effects of a ſevere gout, and other infirmities incident to ſo late a period of life. He was then alſo in the hands of two or three reverend Doctors, who have ſince had many opportunities of diſplaying their attachment to the Church in the moſt eminent ſtations, and who would not fail to ſuggeſt to the expiring Prelate, the merit and the glory of contributing to a ſcheme ſo beneficial and ſo honourable to the Church of *England*. That this Archbiſhop was then under ſome ſuch influence, is highly probable from his mentioning in the codicil, that "many of his brethren of the Propagating So-

(p) Memoirs of Archbiſhop *Tenniſon*, page 13, 14. and 77—101.

" ciety, were ſenſible as well as himſelf of the " neceſſity of ſettling Biſhops in *America*, for " the *wiſe* ends there ſignified;" which naturally refers to ſome converſation on the ſubject, ſtill freſh in his mind, of which he retained the impreſſions ſo long at leaſt as was neceſſary to anſwer the purpoſes of his adviſers. But though Archbiſhop *Teniſon* had not remaining upon his mind " thoſe ſtrong impreſſions of the terrors of " eccleſiaſtical influence," ſo prevalent " at the " latter end of Queen *Anne*'s, and the beginning of " King *George* the firſt's reign;" yet it ſeems thoſe impreſſions ſtill remained with " perſons " in public ſtations," which ſufficiently accounts for the hints in the codicil, *viz.* " the much im- " portunity, and the many [unperformed] pro- " miſes," of eſtabliſhing an Hierarchical juriſdiction and diſcipline, in the north American Colonies. The Miniſters, were aware of the characters of the *importuners*, though the honeſt, unſuſpecting Archbiſhop was not.

In one word, great allowances ought to be made for the *failings* of ſo great and ſo good a man as Archbiſhop *Teniſon*, but nothing can be more invidious, or more injurious to his character, than to hold them up as examples for imitation.

To proceed. His Grace would have it believed, that " ſome people have apprehended, " that the appointment of American Biſhops will " tend

" tend to the depreſſion of the Hierarchy, as it " will afford the Laity here an example of Engliſh " Biſhops abroad with no other than ſpiritual " powers, which may tempt them to think of " reducing the Biſhops at home to the ſame con- " dition (q).

Had his Grace thought proper to inform us who they were that formed ſuch apprehenſions, we might poſſibly have hit upon ſome method of ſatisfying them, different from that his Grace hath taken; which, it is not unlikely Mr *Walpole* might conſider as a ſneer. If theſe apprehenders were ſuch as my Lords the Biſhops had convinced, that none but what his Grace calls *ſpiritual powers*, were to be granted to their American brethren, it would be hard to ſay what melancholy conſequences they might *not* draw from a contemplation on the hardſhip and indignity of ſuch a limitation.

But to raiſe theſe drooping ſpirits, his Grace very comfortably aſſures them, that all is ſafe and ſnug at home, as heart can wiſh. " I ſhould be " very willing," ſays his Grace, " for the bene- " fit of thoſe of our communion in the Colonies, " to run a greater riſque than I conceive this to " be." And the reaſon of his Grace's ſecurity on this head was, it ſeems, that it is " no longer a " ſecret, that the *temporal* powers and privileges " of

(q) Letter to Mr *Walpole*. page 10.

"of my Lords the Biſhops, are merely conceſ-
"ſions from the ſtate (r)."

Here one would imagine, theſe *men of apprehenſion* might aſk, "But, the ſtate obſerving "from the examples of American Biſhops that "theſe temporal powers and privileges might be "ſpared, is there no danger, that it might take "them away?" To this indeed his Grace gives no anſwer, though Mr *Walpole* muſt know he had a very ſubſtantial one in *petto*; namely, that though the ſtate *might* do this, yet as long as the Biſhops, with theſe *powers* and *privileges* continued to make as *harmleſs* and *uſeful* a branch of the conſtitution as *many others*, they run no riſque that the ſtate ever *would*.

This was dextrous enough: for had this reaſon been given, it would have occurred to another ſort of apprehenders, that the ſtate might poſſibly think theſe temporal powers and privileges as *harmleſs* and *uſeful* in the hands of American Prelates, as they are and have been in the hands of their Lordſhips at home; and in conſequence of that notion, would hereafter confer them; an apprehenſion which might have brought his Grace's *ſincerity* a third time in queſtion. And indeed I am ſo far from thinking this *as unlikely to happen as moſt things*, that I cannot but be of opinion, that, had *American* Biſhops been appointed about the time this Letter was written, his

(r) Page 10.

his Grace would have lived to see this event, and yet have been very able to justify his *sincerity* by saying, "Pray, Gentlemen Colonists, do not "blame me. I was very *sincere* in proposing to "limit your Bishops to *spiritual* powers: but who "can I, that you should expect *me* to control "the policy of the state?" Could Mr *Walpole* forbear smiling at the management of his correspondent?

After an uncandid, not to say, unjust comparison of the Church and State principles of the inferior, with those of the superior Clergy, and telling us, by way of striking the balance, "that "there never was a time known when the upper "part of the Clergy were so universally free from "wild high Church notions (*s*)," his Grace, very incautiously complains, that "the regard "which the bulk of the people *had* for religion, "and the teachers of it, is greatly diminished, "and diminishing daily, to a degree," says his Grace, "which I wonder wise men are not alarm-"ed at (*t*)!"

It had been well, his Grace had mentioned the time when the people *had* this *undiminished* regard for religion and the teachers of it, that both the fact and the reasons for it might have been ascertained

(*s*) Witness his Grace's *Lectures*, *Charges*, and *Synod Oration*, and some other performances, well known to have been fabricated under his Grace's patronage and inspection.

(*t*) Page 12.

tained with precision. The *bulk of the people* had, at a certain period, a most *undiminished* regard for Dr *Henry Sacheverel*, and the ſort of religion which he, and a number of other teachers, took care to inculcate. I would hope his Grace did not allude to theſe times, or to teachers like theſe. I would ſuppoſe theſe were the times of thoſe *wild high Church notions*, which his Grace diſclaims for himſelf and the upper part of his brethren. In what reſpect then, does the regard of the bulk of the people for religion, and the teachers of it, appear to be diminiſhed, in times ſubſequent to theſe?

His Grace ſhould by no means have left us in the dark on theſe heads, leſt it ſhould be ſuſpected, either that this *diminiſhed* regard is owing to ſome default in the teachers, or that the teachers who complain of it, require more regard than is due to them. But it was more eſpecially neceſſary his Grace ſhould have been more explicit on this article, as in the very next period his Grace ſeems to ſollicit an increaſe of political power for the teachers of religion, in order to recover this diminiſhed regard from the bulk of the people.

"It is as important, ſays his Grace, even in a "*political* view, that they," [the teachers of religion] "ſhould be able to do good, as that they "ſhould not be able to do harm." A circumſtance that is plainly recommended to the conſi-

deration

deration of those wise men, who, to his Grace's surprise, are not alarmed at the present disregard of the teachers of religion.

Now in this *political view*, the teachers of religion cannot be enabled to do the good required, but by an increase of political power. The spiritual power of preaching the word of God, and of administring with all diligence to the spiritual welfare of their respective flocks, none of the established teachers of religion in this happy country can be supposed either to want, or not to employ under our excellent and *unalienable* ecclesiastical system. Some people indeed are apt to think that more good might be done in this spiritual way, than is done; and will perhaps be ready to say, let the teachers of religion, from the highest to the lowest, first try what good may be done towards recovering this regard of the people, by the serious and diligent application of their spiritual powers; and if this, upon a fair experiment, should be found to be insufficient, it will then be time enough to move for an increase of their *political* power.

But what is extremely unfortunate for his Grace's argument, the Colonists of our communion it seems, are in the same predicament with the bulk of the people in old *England*.

"Nor do I find," adds his Grace, "that bi-"gotry to the Church prevails among the mem-"bers

"ber of it in our Colonies;" (*w*) which can only ſignify, (as that clauſe falls in with what goes before) that, the regard of the bulk of the Church of *England* Coloniſts for religion, and the teachers of it, is equally diminiſhed among them, as in the mother country.

Will not then an increaſe of political power be as neceſſary for theſe new teachers of religion in *America*, as for the old ones at home? And muſt not their limited ſpiritual powers be as ineffectual for a reformation there, as they have been found to be in *England*?

"The Biſhop of *London*'s Commiſſaries," his Grace believes, "have gained no acceſſions to "what was granted them originally." (*w*) The contrary of which is the truth, as will be ſeen below. Not to mention, what has been often hinted, that the Commiſſaries have frequently found the means, not only of pretending to, but of exerciſing powers which never were granted them.

"But the Biſhops will be more narrowly "watched, by the Governors, by other Sects, by "the Laity, and even the Clergy of their own "communion." (*x*)

But what kind of men muſt theſe Biſhops be who want ſo much *watching*, and that by perſons ſo differently intereſted in their appointment? If his Grace knew that this would be the caſe, he muſt

(*w*) Page 12. (*w*) Page 13. (*x*) Ibid.

must have known likewise, that it could only proceed from a *jealouſy* entertained by the Diſſenters of all ranks and denominations, of the natural *tendency* of this Epiſcopal appointment to encroachment and oppreſſion. And with theſe ſentiments, how could his Grace imagine ſuch appointment would ſtir up no *dangerous uneaſineſſes*? But indeed when we conſider the different circumſtances to which this variety of *watching* muſt be directed, one cannot help ſuppoſing that *dangerous uneaſineſſes* muſt be the natural conſequence of this abundant vigilance.

The Governors would watch according to their directions from home, which would probably be, that the Biſhops (the confidants of the crown) ſhould not ſuffer from any diminution of the regard that is due to them; the other ſects would watch, on the contrary, that this regard ſhould not ariſe above what they *imagine* is due to them, which they would fix at a much lower ſtandard than the Governors would think reaſonable; the Laity would watch, that they might not be haraſſed with Eccleſiaſtical cenſures; and the Clergy would watch to inforce them, and to ſupport the regard due to Epiſcopal Power; and in that they would certainly find their account, as the Biſhops muſt have the power of rewarding, or at leaſt of recommending the meritorious, as well as conſuting delinquents.

However,

However, that the Biſhops would be more narrowly watched than the Commiſſaries have been, is contrary to all experience. A man would have little chance for redreſs againſt the arbitrary acts of a juſtice of the peace, who could not obtain ſatisfaction for the inſults of a petty conſtable. One cannot but wonder his Grace ſhould not feel the ridicule to which this childiſh repreſentation would expoſe him.

The remainder of his Grace's lucubrations in this paragraph, are built upon the ſame ſort of hypotheſes; militating partly againſt matter of fact, and partly againſt each other, as where he ſpeaks of "Governors *watching* the Biſhops," who "will nevertheleſs be ſuch perſons as the Crown "*can beſt confide in* (*y*)." Might not his Grace as well have ſaid, that the *Governors* would be *more narrowly watched* by the *Biſhops*? and again "a right of recalling them may be reſerved to the "King." Does his Grace mean, a right of putting an end to their function? ſo it ſhould ſeem as, *ex hypotheſi*, this *recalling* muſt be on account of their miſdemeanours. It is a *material* queſtion, and I ſhould like to ſee an anſwer to it, from ſome of thoſe to whom his Grace has bequeathed his principles on the article of Church Authority.

His Grace having done his endeavour to quiet our apprehenſions with reſpect to an increaſe of Church Power among the Americans, by lending them

(*y*) Page 13.

them Biſhops, on mere ſuppoſitions and probabilities, proceeds to ſtrengthen his caſe by referring to actual precedents!

"It ought to be conſidered further, ſays his "Grace, that an Act of the laſt ſeſſion of Parlia-"ment [1749] which paſſed without any oppoſition "from any body, hath *expreſsly eſtabliſhed* Mo-"RAVIAN Biſhops in *Abyſſinia*, who have much "higher and ſtricter notions of Church Govern-"ment and Diſcipline than we have(x)."

Bold and ſurprizing! His Grace ventures no leſs than the ſuppoſition that Mr *Walpole* muſt never have ſeen the Act in queſtion, nor have known any thing of the contents of it.

Can any Man of common Senſe underſtand leſs by the words, *expreſsly eſtabliſhed*, than that the Act gives theſe Moravian Biſhops a power to exerciſe their function, aſſigns them their ſtations, and ſecures their ſtipends?

And yet the caſe is only this. The *Moravians*, to whom this Act relates, are ſuch as ſcruple to take an oath, or to ſerve perſonally in the army. This Law diſpenſes with them in both theſe Articles, upon condition of their making a ſolemn affirmation inſtead of an oath, and paying a ſum of money ſufficient to hire a ſubſtitute to perform military ſervice in their room.

But leſt the Government ſhould be impoſed upon by perſons pretending to be of the *Moravian* So-

 ciety

(x) Page 14.

ciety who are not, it is enacted, that every one who claims the benefit of this act, ſhall produce a certificate ſigned by ſome Biſhop of the ſaid Church, or by the Paſtor of ſuch Church or Congregation who ſhall be neareſt to the place where the claim is made, that he is actually a member of the ſaid Church.

And to prevent frauds or forgeries of falſe certificates, it is farther enacted, that the advocate of the ſaid Church ſhall lay or cauſe to be laid before the Commiſſioners for Trade and Plantations a liſt or liſts of all the Biſhops of the ſaid Church who are appointed by them to grant certificates as aforeſaid, together with their hand-writing and uſual ſeal, and the names hand-writing and ſeals of any Biſhops that ſhall hereafter be conſecrated by them, as aforeſaid; and the names of ſuch Paſtors, as ſhall be authoriſed by the ſaid Advocate or Biſhops to give certificates in any of his Majeſty's Colonies in *America* (*a*).

Undoubtedly his Grace might give what names to what things he pleaſed, and ſo might call this an Act for eſtabliſhing *Moravian* Biſhops in *America*. But we are not obliged to adopt his Grace's ideas. It is not even ſaid that theſe certifying Biſhops ſhould be reſident in *America*; and for any thing that appears, they might be ſuch as reſided in *England*, *Poland*, *Pruſſia*, *Sileſia*, &c. in all which, and in other places, the Act ſays, the Moravian Church is ſettled; and theſe Biſhops indeed are

(*a*) 22d GEORGE II. cap. 30.

are juſt as *expreſſly eſtabliſhed* by this Act, in thoſe countries, as in *America*.

His Grace affirms, that this Act was paſſed without any oppoſition from any body. But, *Rimius*, the virulent chaſtiſer of the Moravians, aſſures us it was oppoſed by a certain member, upon a ſuggeſtion, that "the Moravians in *Germany* had "made the greateſt part of Proteſtants run mad "by their devices." When he could not prevail to have the Bill thrown out, the ſame perſon propoſed that they ſhould be reſtrained from making converts; which was likewiſe diſregarded, for a reaſon which ſhall be mentioned by and by (*b*).

"Why then" ſays his Grace (arguing a *fortiori*) "ſhould there be ſuch fear of eſtabliſhing Biſhops "of the Church of *England*?"

A queſtion which ſuppoſes theſe *Moravian* Biſhops were eſtabliſhed with the knowledge and conſent of the Coloniſts; which every one knows could not be the caſe; and in all probability this Act was paſſed, before the *Americans* knew that any ſuch thing was thought of. And even with reſpect to our own people at home, Biſhop *Lavington*, who knew as much of what paſſed in parliament as his brother of *Oxford*, informs us, that "the ſettlement of the *Moravians* in theſe Kingdoms ſeems to have been obtained *ſurreptitiouſly*, "under pretence of their being a peaceable inno-"cent

(*b*) Preface to the Supplement to the Candid Narrative, *page* cxvii.

" cent ſort of people." But his Lordſhip hoped that " their iniquity and ſlenderneſs being laid open by Mr *Rimius* and himſelf, they would be compelled to emigrate, as had been found neceſſary in other countries (*b*)."

Doubtleſs his Grace's argument *a fortiori* hath great force and propriety, in reference to this precedent.

His Grace's expoſtulation indeed is founded on the conſideration, that " the Moravians have much " higher and ſtricter notions of Church Govern- " ment and Diſcipline, than we of the Church of " *England* have." Well then, let us conſider what ſort of Biſhops theſe Moravians have among them.

The *Unitas fratrum*, in whoſe favour the Act under conſideration was made, are ſaid there, to be members of the Church which was formerly ſettled in *Moravia* and *Bohemia*: the remains of which was then ſettled in *Poland*. Among theſe Count *Zinzendorf* was ordained, or if you pleaſe, conſecrated a Biſhop at *Liſſa*. But here, " all " their Miniſters were on an equal footing; the " eldeſt of them, without having reſpect to the " importance of his cure, is always choſen a ſe- " nior or elder for the ſake of Ordinations, and " is nothing elſe but *primus inter pares*, having " not the leaſt juriſdiction or authority over the " other

(*b*) Preface to the *Moravians* Compared, page xiv.

other Clergy (c)." This gives us no very striking idea of the high Church notions of these *Moravians* with respect to Church Government and Discipline. And would the English Bishops designed for *America*, consent to a reduction of this kind, perhaps the Colonists might give the project a farther consideration.

But supposing the *Moravian* Bishops to be expressly established in *America*, and to have all the prelatical powers with which our English Bishops are invested, what is the consequence? A very unfortunate one for his Grace's project, if Mr *Rimius* is to be believed, who when he wanted to exclude the *Moravian* Bishops from exercising their function in *England*, confronted them with a *Canon* of the first *Nicene* Council, which enjoins, that two Bishops shall not preside together in the same city. The *Moravian* Bishops, according to this doctrine, have a canonical title by *preoccupation*, and the English Bishops must be excluded of course from *America*, on the pain of being censured as uncanonical interlopers.

"If for want of these" [English Bishops] continues his Grace, "the *Moravian* Bishops should "ordain such Ministers for our people as they thought proper, or should they, by administring confirmation, or by the reverence of their "Episcopal Character, be continually gaining converts

(c) Rimius ubi supra, Preface to the other

"converts from us, it would be a very undeſire-
"able thing on many accounts, particularly on
"this, that moſt of them refuſe taking oaths, and
"bearing arms."

Had I been of counſel with the publiſhers of this Letter, I ſhould certainly have adviſed them to have ſuppreſſed this paſſage, unleſs they could have added a note to ſhew that theſe converſions had actually been made by the *Moravians* in alarming numbers, and that undeſireable conſequences had proceeded from them. As matters now turn out, this idle ſcarecrow is conſigned to contempt and ridicule by the experience of twenty years, during which no ſuch events have been heard of.

But this is not the worſt. His Grace, by this unwary auguration is expoſed to a very obvious reflection, namely, that "a power of ordaining and "confirming, together with the reverence of the "Epiſcopal Character, are very likely means of "continually gaining proſelytes." And what was *undeſireable* with reſpect to theſe *Moravian* Biſhops in his Grace's account, we may be ſure would be *undeſireable* in the account of the Non-conforming Coloniſts, with reſpect to Biſhops of the Church of *England*. They will therefore conſider this inſinuation as the effect of his Grace's inadvertently dropping the maſk, and as exhibiting a full view of his expectations from the eſtabliſhment of Biſhops in *America*.

But

But after all, on what accounts would these conversions be undesireable? one would have expected from an English Prelate to have had one of these accounts at least specified; as affecting the religion of the converts, viz. the *undesirableness* of having our people converted from a *better* religion to a *worse*. But then, what must have been said for Archbishop *Potter*, who, in a complimentary letter to Count *Zinzendorf*, so highly extols the orthodoxy of the *Moravian* Church, "acknowledging its full agreement with the Church of "*England*, both in the purity of the primitive "faith, and in the defence of the primitive discipline?" and if Dr *Potter* was *sincere* in this, we may be very sure that how high and strict soever the notions of the Moravians may be concerning Church Government and Discipline, they are neither higher nor stricter than the notions of the Church of *England* on those subjects, if a learned and orthodox Archbishop of *Canterbury* may determine for her (*d*).

It was mentioned above, that when the act in favour of the Moravians was under the consideration of Parliament, a certain member who opposed it, not being able to prevail to have it thrown out, proposed to have them restrained from making converts. This was likewise rejected "by "majority" says *Rimius*, "taking these people

(*d*) Biographia Britannica, vol. vii. And. *Zinzendorf*, Rem. [G.]

" for the ancient Moravian Church." Which affords another reason why his Grace (to whom this transaction could hardly be unknown) would not mention the conversions made by the Moravians as undesirable on a *religious* account, as the parliament had seemed to determine, that the religious principles of the Americans would not be hurt by their being converted to the *Moravian* system.

His Grace's political reason for standing in awe of these *conversions*, would, I suppose, be less considerable with Mr *Walpole*, as nothing *disagreeable*, of this sort at least, had arose from the Pensylvanian Quakers, who profess the same principles with these *Moravians*.

The nonjuring *Jacobite* Bishops in our Colonies, we may well suppose to be mere nonentities, as his Grace himself is so very doubtful about them.

" But popish Bishops also," his Grace apprehends, " have recourse to the Colonies from time " time. At least," says his Grace, " the Bishop " of *Quebec* hath no small influence in a very " important new settlement of ours." (*e*)

A shrewd writer in the *London* Chronicle of *August* 22, seems disposed to believe, from the mention here made of this *new* settlement, that this Letter to Mr *Walpole* is certainly *spurious*, as this settlement was not *ours* till eight years after

(*e*) Letter, page 15.

after the date of it. To which might be added, that from the time this settlement became *ours*, till after the peace of *Fontainbleau*, there was no popish Bishop at *Quebec*. Nor indeed could this clause be pen'd, unless by the spirit of prophecy, till the year 1764, when the present popish Bishop of *Quebec*, embarked in *England* for his new diocese, where he could have no personal influence, great or small, before his arrival.

But instead of relying upon this as a proof that this Letter is spurious, I am inclined to think it more probable, that his Grace thought proper to *retouch* this favourite rescript from time to time; retrenching possibly some topics he had made use of in his answer to Dr *Mayhew*'s observations, and adding others, as new incidents arose relative to his subject. Of this there are, if I mistake not, evident traces in other parts of this Letter, though none perhaps which afford so manifest indications of *a mind sympathizing with bodily infirmities*.

For might not his Grace have been asked, How came this Bishop of *Quebec* by his no small influence? How came he there at all? Was not the *establishment* of a popish Bishop in an important new settlement under his Majesty's government, a matter worthy of the interposition of a protestant Archbishop? Was not his Grace then at the head of the Church of *England*? And was it ever heard that his Grace remonstrated either

in

in public or private, against a measure so seemingly inconsistent with the interests and honour of the Church of *England*, and even with the safety of our protestant government?

This is not the first time I have heard these questions asked; and I wish I could say I had ever heard a more satisfactory answer to them, than that the profound silence observed on that occasion, was with a view to obtain a precedent for settling Church of *England* Bishops in *America*.

But whatever might be the reason of his Grace's *acquiescence* at that period, certain it is that the toleration of a popish Bishop at *Quebec*, has been brought as an argument for establishing protestant Bishops in the Colonies, in certain discourses delivered before a certain Society, where his Grace presided; and in this very pamphlet his Grace was not ashamed to plead the example of popish Bishops at home, who, he tells us, "perform the same religious acts by *connivance*, "which he proposes his *American* Bishops should "be impowered to do by authority." (*f*)

Can these precedents be *decently* pleaded by the fathers of the Church of *England* for establishing protestant Bishops in *America*, but upon the supposition that the toleration of popish Bishops is absolutely void of danger, both here and in *America*?

(*f*) Ibid. page 19.

America? And yet, to ſerve the ſame turn another way, his Grace, moſt inconſiſtently ſuppoſes the danger from the influence of the Biſhop of *Quebec* to be great, and ſtill greater from the neglect of not having Biſhops of our own in that country to counteract this influence. Which however, is an hypotheſis contrary to a known fact. For to what can this counteraction amount in the Colonies where a popiſh Biſhop is permitted by more than *connivance*, when, as we learn from his Grace on another occaſion, *popiſh Biſhops reſide here and perform every part of their function without offence and without obſervation*, (*g*) in ſpite of the vigilance of twenty-ſix Prelates of the eſtabliſhed Church, and the terror of ſtrict laws, wiſely provided by our proteſtant anceſtors againſt the pernicious effects of the intolerant ſpirit and deſtructive principles of theſe very Biſhops.

We are now arrived at the third queſtion, *viz.* "Whether ſuch an appointment, however harmleſs and uſeful it might be otherwiſe, would "not ſtir up dangerous uneaſineſſes, abroad or "at home? And here," ſays his Grace, "it is "aſked, If the members of our Church in "*America*, would like to have Biſhops among "them, why they never petitioned for them?" (*b*) This queſtion, without all doubt, came from Mr

(*g*) Anſwer to Dr *Mayhew*'s obſervations, page 66.

(*b*) Letter, page 15.

Mr *Walpole*, and therefore we may fafely take it for granted, that no petition for Bifhops had ever been offered on the part of thefe Church of *England* Coloniſts. It will be neceſſary to give his Grace's anſwer to it in his own words.

" Surely their omitting it may well be aſcribed " in part, to the thoughtleſsneſs of mankind " about their religious concerns, which hath been " ſo peculiarly great in thoſe countries, that ſome " of them did not petition for help, when they " had no one office of Chriſtianity adminiſtred " among them." (*i*)

Turn over the leaf, and there you will find it thus written, " Indeed of courſe it ſhould be pre- " ſumed, and none but the very ſtrongeſt evi- " dence admitted to the contrary, that all perſons " deſire to have within their reach, the means " of exerciſing their religion completely." (*k*)

What is now to be done to reconcile the *fact* to the *preſumption?* We are to preſume, that *all perſons* deſire, what the thoughtleſsneſs of mankind, and ſtrong evidence from a moſt remarkable caſe to confirm it, plainly ſhew that *all perſons* do not deſire.

Take the matter of fact, and you find the Church of *England* Coloniſts in ſo abandoned a ſtate of negligence and indolence about their religious concerns, that there is not the leaſt probability that a whole bench of Biſhops would recall them

(*i*) Ibid. (*k*) Page 16.

them to a due attention. For it appears by the sequel, that missionaries have been sent them unpetitioned for, without the least good effect. They continue as thoughtless about their religious concerns as ever, as appears from their not petitioning to have the compleat exercise of their religion within their reach.

Take the presumption, and you must conclude they are persuaded that they already have within their reach the means of exercising their religion completely without Bishops; and that his Grace was only inventing reasons for their not petitioning suitable to his own ideas.

I shall not inquire into the matter of fact, namely, how far any part of the Colonies, was ever without the administration of any one office of Christianity among them: I have been told, it is not true; but be that as it may, I have his Grace's own testimony before me, given when he was Bishop of *Oxford*, that they who were in the most deplorable circumstances of this sort, were not slack in petitioning for relief.

"In these circumstances," said the Bishop of *Oxford*, "the poor inhabitants made from ALL PARTS "the most affecting representations of their de-"plorable condition, the truth of which was but "too fully confirmed by their respective Go-"vernors, and the persons of principal note among

"among them." In this vanity of his Grace's accounts, what are we to believe?

Another reason why these Colonists did not petition, is, that "probably too many of their "Clergy think, they may both live more negligently, and have a better chance for preferment now, than if a Bishop were to inspect "them, and ordain natives to be their rivals." (l)

This may be a reason why these negligent, aspiring, envious Clergymen, should *not* petition, but is rather a reason why the Laity *should*, especially if "they desire to have within their reach, "the means of exercising their religion *completely*;" for this they can no more have under negligent pastors, than they can have it without Bishops. But indeed, if the Lay-Colonists took their measures from experience and history, they would hardly think the negligence or ambition of their pastors were likely to be cured by petitioning for Bishops. It is hardly to be supposed

* See the Bishop of *Oxford*'s Sermon before the Society for the *Propagation*, &c. *Feb.* 1740—41. page 5. second edition, octavo. It is certain that *all parts* of our American Colonies were never in this deplorable condition, and that any representations of that sort must be false, unless, by a mean and disreputable equivocation, the preacher meant, that the offices administred by the non-conformist pastors, are *not* offices of Christianity. Consult Dr *Mayhew*'s observations on the charter and conduct, &c. chapters v. and vi.

(l) Letter, page 15.

posed but these Colonists must have some conception how matters have stood in the mother country in former times, as well as in the present. They must be aware, that there have been times, at no great distance from the migration of their ancestors to *America*, when the Bishops of *England* were deprived of their power. The present age, wherein the Bishops of the mother country enjoy their power under the protection of the state and the law, they have before them in full contemplation, and they may if they please, compare the diligence, humility, and simplicity of common pastors and ministers of the Church at these different periods. They will at least perceive, that there were more temptations to negligence and ambition in the one situation, than in the other. Commendams, dispensations for pluralities, and fine-cures, (the parents of non-residence, and the lures of ecclesiastical ambition) are appendages to Episcopal Churches, and, as some people imagine, substantial obstructions to christian edification. There is a chance at least that religion would be upon a better footing where the Clergy have not these indulgences to look for: and they who are negligent and ambitious without them, would hardly be more diligent or less aspiring when they are thrown in their way.

At length his Grace suggests a third reason to Mr *Walpole* why these Colonists did not petition

for

for Biſhops, which is, that "the inhabitants "of the Colonies, living at ſuch a diſtance, and "not knowing when an Application to the Go-"vernment might be ſeaſonable, and being "aſſured, that the Biſhops here, eſpecially the "Biſhop of *London*, and the Society for Pro-"pagating the Goſpel, would always be attentive to this point, have left it to them. And "they to whom it is thus left, have received abun-"dant proofs, that very great numbers of the "Laity of the Church of *England*, in thoſe coun-"tries, of higher as well as lower rank, *earneſtly* "*deſire* to have Biſhops ſettled there, and think "it would be a moſt valuable public benefit (*m*)."

But how comes it that Mr *Walpole*, a miniſter of ſtate, ſhould never know of all this? How comes it, that the Biſhops and the Society to whom this matter was left, with ſo full confidence, that they would always be attentive to it, never either petitioned the Government themſelves on behalf of thoſe who put this confidence in them, or apprized the Government of the earneſt deſires of theſe Coloniſts to have Biſhops ſettled among them?

Whatever his Grace might do, I am perſuaded Mr *Walpole* did not quibble upon the word, *petition*; but aſſuredly meant that it never appeared to the Government, that the Coloniſts had any ſuch *earneſt deſires* to have a Biſhop among them: and that whatever had been laid before the Govern-

ment

(*m*) Letter, page 16.

ment by the Biſhops and the Society, of this ſort, had fallen ſhort of the proof that was required.

The real truth, I believe, is, that the miſſionaries have been from time to time inſtructed to uſe their endeavours to procure ſuch petitions from the Coloniſts, in which ſome of them have not been remiſs, as appears ſufficiently by Dr *Bradbury Chandler*'s Pamphlets. But, as it ſhould ſeem, without any effect, except perhaps, ſome intimations from their Governors and Counſellors who are appointed in them other country. Every one knows, that his Grace, after his acceſſion to the See of *Canterbury*, was particularly aſſiduous in promoting an Epiſcopal eſtabliſhment in *America*, in which pious project, Mr *Apthorp* and the ſaid Dr *Chandler* ſeem to have been his moſt conſiderable inſtruments. And as no body ever heard of theſe *earneſt deſires* of the Coloniſts to give into this ſcheme ſo early as the year 1750, before the notice given us in this Letter, it is probable his Grace might have been privately at work on this project, from the moment he was inveſted with the lawn. Whether he had any coadjutors, after the demiſe of Bp *Gibſon*, (from whom moſt probably he derived his *enticement* for this Meaſure) I cannot ſay; but from that period the Biſhop of *Oxford* was undoubtedly the maſter workman, and knew more of the pains that had been taken at home and abroad to carry the point of petitioning, than any of his brethren. But unfortunately Mr *Walpole* happened to know

as much as the Bishop of *Oxford*, who, for want of the *abundant proof* that Mr *Walpole* had reason to demand, is obliged to fly to the miserable expedient of *presuming* upon, what he had himself before shewn to be contrary to the matter of fact.

But tho' this affair of *petitioning* could not be brought about, yet his Grace informs us, that "the Bishops and the Society, to whom this matter was left, had found no cause to imagine that any opposition would be made to it from that quarter (*o*)." Which is cautiously enough worded, and perhaps implies no more, than that it was more reasonable for them to believe the accounts transmitted to them by their own Missionaries, than those which came from any other quarter.

"It is true," says his Grace, "some of them "have provided against enlarging the jurisdic"tion of the Commissaries; but none of them "have expressed any *public reluctance* to the ap"pointment of Bishops (*p*)."

Some of them; i.e. of the lay Colonists of the Church of *England*. But these, whoever they were, could not thus *provide* without some public act of the whole body, or of the whole representative. Whence I suppose the Government would easily conceive with what reluctance they would listen to the appointment of a superior power, when

(*o*) Page 16. (*p*) Page 17.

when they had been ſo careful to provide againſt the oppreſſion of an inferior (q).

(q) How they were diſpoſed towards the appointment of Biſhops, about this time, may be underſtood from the following anecdote. In *May* 1749, *Ekakim Palmer* Eſq; introduced Mr *Hooper* (one of the Council of *Barbadoes*, poſſeſſed of a conſiderable plantation there) to the Biſhop of *London* [Dr *Sherlock*]. Mr *Hooper*, on that occaſion, told his Lordſhip, that "he and all their people diſliked the project." He informed his Lordſhip likewiſe, that his Lordſhip's Commiſſary there, requeſted an Act to impower him to ſuſpend ſuch Clergymen as were infamous in their lives. One Clergyman of unexceptionable character, oppoſed it, and ſo the power was granted for three years only. One of the firſt acts of this Commiſſary was, to enſnare this good man. At a public meeting they put an ingredient into his punch, to make him drunk. So ſoon as he found himſelf not well, he quitted the place, and went homeward. His way was through a long narrow paſſage. There they placed a common whore, who, as inſtructed, clung about him, with other indecencies. The good man however ſhook her off, and went directly home. They had placed two men about this narrow paſſage to obſerve what paſſed. The next day he received a ſummons to appear before the Commiſſary, to a charge of being drunk and picking up a whore, and taking her into that paſſage to gratify his luſt. The two men witneſſed againſt him, and the Commiſſary ſuſpended him. The whole pariſh were diſſatisfied, and applied to the Commiſſary to take off the ſuſpenſion, but he refuſed. They then applied to the Governor and Council, to uſe their intereſt with the Commiſſary, that he might be reſtored to them. They did ſo, but to no purpoſe. The people, nettled at this refuſal, demanded a libel againſt another Clergyman of an infamous and profligate character. The charge was proved, but the Commiſſary did not exerciſe his power; for this latter was at

If the Colonists expressed no *public reluctance* to the appointment of Bishops among them, it was a testimony of their good sense and prudent caution, as no *public attempt* had been made towards such an appointment. His Grace indeed says, that, "for above forty years past, the inhabitants there "must have had frequent notices, by various "ways,

the head of those who requested the Court to grant the power. When Mr *Hooper* had told this story to the Bishop, he added, "And now, my Lord, will you send a Bishop to us, who "will have this, and greater powers?" His Lordship answered, *It is not I that send Bishops to* America, *it is the Society for Propagating the Gospel in foreign Parts, who are the movers of this matter*. Mr *Hooper* replied, "I do not care who are "the movers, but this I can with confidence assure your Lord-"ship, that if ever a Bishop sets foot on our Island, the people "will toss him into the Sea." This so affected the Bishop, that he told those concerned, they had best drop the design of sending a Bishop to the Sugar-Islands, for those people were too hot to be dealt with, and stick only to the other part of the proposal, *viz.* to send one to the Continent. In consequence, Letters were written to *Virginia*, to get Letters from thence, requesting a Bishop might be sent there. But a Gentleman concerned for that Colony in *England*, being aware of this secret negociation, immediately wrote to one of the principal Gentlemen of the Council there; by which means the project was disappointed for that time. It will, I suppose, hardly be doubted that the Bishop of *Oxford* was at that time *one of those concerned* in this Episcopizing scheme; and yet, he cannot be supposed, to have witten this Letter under a consciousness of these facts, without the utmost disingenuity: not to mention, that he could not suppose but Mr *Walpole* must know enough

ſt ways, that ſuch a deſign was in agitation." *p.* 17. Poſſibly they had; but theſe were notices only of ſecret cabals and intrigues of particular perſons, and perhaps ſome private application to men in power. But while the deſign was kept private, and confided to a truſty junto, the reſt were at liberty to deny it, and then, what would the Co-

loniſts

enough of theſe proceedings to be able to contradict him. And therefore to ſave Dr *Secker* the reputation of his *ſincerity*, we muſt conclude, that my Lord of *London* did not chooſe to communicate to him the particulars of the intelligence he received from Mr *Hooper*, or to make him privy to his Lordſhip's correſpondence with Mr *Walpole*. We ſee, Biſhop *Sherlock* diſclaimed having any particular ſhare in ſending Biſhops to *America*, and lays the project to the account of the Propagating Society, where no doubt he had obſerved the Biſhop of *Oxford*'s headlong zeal for accompliſhing this meaſure at all events; and being a man of infinitely more prudence, as well as abilities, than Dr *Secker*, he determined to have no more to do with him in this affair, than was unavoidable, as a Member of the Propagating Society. The Editors probably thought it might be giving ſome conſequence to his Grace, to repreſent him in the Advertiſement, as going hand in hand with Biſhop *Sherlock* in this Epiſcopizing project, and might hope that the inconſiſtency of this repreſentation with what his Grace hath recorded in the firſt page of his Letter, would be overlooked by his Grace's friends and admirers. But have they not rather given occaſion to ſuſpect by this piece of art, that his Grace had no more conſequence with Mr *Walpole*, than with Biſhop *Sherlock*? And that however his Grace came by a ſight of that Gentleman's Letter to Biſhop *Sherlock*, his pretended Anſwer to it was never out of the confines of his ſtudy till the memorable year 1769?

lonists have got by their *public reluctance*? Even the honour of being laughed at for running to uncertain rumours, and fighting with a shadow!

His Grace next proceeds to quiet the apprehensions of those who might be made uneasy by the consideration of the expence required to maintain these colony Bishops, and tells us, "it is not intended to burden the Crown or the subject with "it." *p.* 17.

As if the gifts and contributions, mentioned just after by his Grace, would be no burden upon the subject? Some families must want what is thus given and contributed, for what they will think, perhaps, more necessary uses. How often have we had Briefs for the purpose of supporting the Society's unmitred missionaries? And would his Grace have insured us, that none of these would be circulated for the nobler purpose of supporting the dignity of Bishops? And are these no burden to the subject?

But where was his Grace's memory, where was the modesty of the Editors of this Letter, who could let such a declaration pass, after Dr *Thomas Bradbury Chandler* had been at the pains to calculate *how inconsiderable* a tax upon the Americans would be, to maintain a requisite number of American Bishops? And how scurvily does this Dr come off, (when pressed upon this head by Dr *Chauncey*) with a silly quibbling distinction between, "what it "would be *equitable* to pay," and "what, no "man, if he denied to pay, would deserve to be

"considered

"considered in the light of a good subject, or "member of Society (r)."

His Grace, after acknowledging that the Presbyterians and Independents of *New England* have signified their *diſlike* of his project *of late*, condeſcends to ſay, that, "there never was any thought "of placing them there," *p.* 118.

How does this agree with Biſhop *Sherlock*'s exhortation, "to ſtick to the propoſal of ſending a Bi"ſhop to the continent?" But whatever his Grace's *thoughts* might be in 1750, it is certain that *New England*, after his promotion to *Canterbury*, was the principal object of his Grace's cares for Epiſcopal reformation in *America*. However, ſo tender was he of giving theſe people offence at the time he was writing to Mr *Walpole*, that his Grace is pleaſed to allow, that "if they ſhould object "againſt Biſhops coming occaſionally to officiate "amongſt

(r) *The Appeal defended, or, the propoſed* American *Epiſcopate vindicated, in anſwer to the objections and miſrepreſentations of* Dr Chauncey *and others.* By THOMAS BRADBURY CHANDLER, D. D. *New York*, printed by *Hugh Gaine*, at the Bible and Crown, in *Hanover Square*, 1769. p. 249, 250. Whoever will be at the pains to compare this *Defence* with Dr *Secker*'s Letter to Mr *Walpole*, will very ſeriouſly lament Dr *Chandler*'s misfortune in being ſtationed *three thouſand miles* from his Biſhop, by whoſe inſtructions the *Appeal* was written, and for whoſe honour it was to be defended. He might otherwiſe have avoided the mortification of ſeeing his high pretenſions to the rights and privileges of the American Epiſcopate, ſo remarkably contraſted with his Grace's humble conceſſions, in an hour of deſpondency.

"amongſt thoſe of the Epiſcopal perſuaſion in "that province, — *that* might be omitted."

Now it is well known, that the Society's Miſſionaries in *New England* have always been more, in a double proportion at leaſt, than in the other provinces in *America*. In the year 1761, about thirty Miſſionaries were ſtationed in *New England*, while in *New York*, *New Jerſey*, *Pennſylvania*, *North Carolina*, *South Carolina*, *Georgia*, the *Bahama Iſlands*, and *Barbadoes*, there were no more than forty-nine, according to the Society's *Abſtracts*. (s)

If then, notwithſtanding the reaſonableneſs of the propoſal in the abſtract, notwithſtanding what belongs to the nature of Epiſcopal Churches, and the indiſpenſable neceſſity of Confirmation to the complete exerciſe of their religion; notwithſtanding the neceſſity of overlooking the conduct of *vagabond ſtrangers*, ſo indifferently qualified, as his Grace repreſents many of them to be, — If, I ſay, notwithſtanding all theſe conſiderations, the perſonal miniſtrations of a Biſhop in *New England*, where there are thirty Epiſcopal Churches, may be omitted, it ſeems ſcarce worth the while to ſend Biſhops, with the expenſive appointments ſuitable to the dignity of their character, to preſide over forty-nine Miſſionaries diſperſed in eight extenſive provinces, where even the ſingle ceremony of Confirmation, to be completely exerciſed,

(s) *Mayhew*'s Obſervations, page 45. *London* edition.

ciſed, could hardly be performed by the labours of ten or a dozen Biſhops, if the uninſtructed Negroes are to be taken into the account.

After all, his Grace ſeems to be conſcious, that the true queſtions would come to this, Whether dangerous uneaſineſſes would not be ſtirred up in the Colonies, by the appointment of Biſhops? And whether the Coloniſts would not have ſufficient grounds for their uneaſineſſes, from their experience of the incroaching nature of Epiſcopacy?

In anſwer to this latter queſtion, his Grace thinks fit to ſay, that the Coloniſts, "cannot fail to know how much the Epiſcopal power exerciſed heretofore by Biſhops, hath long ſince been leſſened, and the inclinations and principles of thoſe who are intruſted with it, altered for the better." (*t*) This hath been conſidered before, and we need only refer for an anſwer to it, to the paſſage quoted above from his Grace's *Oratio Synodalis*. Let us add however, as this matter is once more come upon the carpet, that what his Grace aſcribes to the *better inclinations and principles* of himſelf and his contemporary brethren, is conſidered by other ſtanch Churchmen, as an unhappy relaxation of that ancient diſcipline, which the Church wiſhes, in one of her offices, to have reſtored. Of this complexion is the zealous Dr *Thomas Bradbury Chandler*, whom every one now underſtands to ſpeak the *real, undiſguiſed* ſenſe,

(*t*) Page 18.

ſenſe of Dr *Secker*, both in the *Appeal*, and in his *Defence* of it.

"The want of primitive diſcipline in the "Church at home," ſaith this diligent Miſſionary, "is no proof that the want of it is not ſtill greater "in the Colonies, nor that the want cannot in "ſome degree, be remedied by the propoſed "Epiſcopate. We think that a ſtrict diſcipline, "with regard to the American Clergy, might "be exerciſed under an Epiſcopate. *This is certainly expected.* IT IS AN IMPORTANT PART "OF OUR PLAN; and that American Biſhops "would diſappoint us in this reſpect, none have "a right to declare, until the experiment ſhall "have been made." (*u*)

Why no indeed, worthy Doctor, I dare ſay the Coloniſts have no ſuch ſuſpicion; and therefore, I preſume, it is, that they are ſo unwilling, and with great reaſon, to have the experiment made. How little was this ſtrenuous champion aware, while he was writing this, that ſome of his fellow pupils at home were convincing the world, that there was a time, when their common patron had denied every word of it; and that in ſpite of his *Oratio Synodalis*, this denial was agreeable to his dying ſentiments? After this, truſt, ye Coloniſts, if you can, to the ſincerity of thoſe who ſolicit an *American* Epiſcopate. None of you can be at a loſs to know what a high-flying Epiſcopalian means by *primitive diſcipline*, while the hiſtory

(*u*) *Appeal defended*, page 103.

hiſtory of the ſettlement of your anceſtors in *America* remains. None of you can be ignorant, that the *juriſdiction* required to carry *this primitive diſcipline* into execution, muſt be as different from the *plan* delineated in this Letter, as your own plan is from that of Archbiſhop *Laud*. For while his Grace is aſſuring you, that, "no more authority is deſired for American Biſhops, than the diſſenting Miniſters exerciſe here by law, "or popiſh Prieſts and Biſhops by connivance:" Dr *Chandler*, whoſe inſtructions are of a later date, betrays his own and his party's *expectations*, that *a ſtrict primitive diſcipline, with reſpect to the* American *Clergy*, without diſtinction, may be exerciſed under this new Epiſcopate.

Attending his Grace to *page* 19, we find ſomething like an apology for the propagating Society's ſending Letters into *America*. One would wiſh to know, what circumſtance of Mr *Walpole*'s Letter, gave occaſion to it. Making due allowances for his Grace's palliations and gloſſes, the caſe ſeems to have been this. The zealous promoters of *American* Epiſcopacy in the Society, finding that the want of petitions from the Colonies was a conſiderable obſtruction to the project, ſent Letters privately to their confidants to procure ſuch teſtimonies, (*viz.* that the Coloniſts approved the meaſure) as might be a balance at leaſt againſt the aſſurances the government had received, that they were averſe to it. The practice came to be detected, and the alarm being taken

by

by the friends of religious liberty; the too probable conſequences of it were remonſtrated to the government. This brought ſome *blame* upon the contrivers of this ſecret correſpondence, which his Grace ſought here to ward off, as well as he could; modeſtly requeſting in the end, that the government would permit them to play out their game, before they rejected the propoſal.

His Grace's next endeavour is to take off Mr *Walpole*'s apprehenſions, that the attempt, and much more the execution of ſuch a project, "would raiſe animoſities at home, produce de-"clamations in pulpits, controverſies in pam-"phlets, debates in parliament, revive the diſtinc-"tions of high and low among Churchmen, and "terrify and provoke the Diſſenters." (*w*)

What his Grace ſays on the part of the pulpit, ſhall be conſidered by and by. And as for the preſs, he reminds Mr *Walpole*, that, "moſt vi-"rulent pamphlets, publiſhed daily both againſt "Church and State, gave the government no "terror at all." (*x*) Not ſo much indeed, I dare ſay, as his Grace thought they ſhould have given, judging herein by his own feelings; no man perhaps, of his ſtation, having ever been more terrified and diſquieted by pamphlets and letters in News-papers on Church matters, than the late Dr *Sterne*. Of the fact however, or of its effects, he was far from being ſo competent a judge as Mr *Walpole*, who was very ſenſible, that it would not follow, becauſe

(*w*) Page 20. (*x*) Page 21.

becauſe the miniſtry were not affected by falſe and invidious charges from the preſs, reſpecting their political conduct in mere ſtate affairs, that they would be equally unaffected, when to ſevere a ſtroke upon the religious liberties of the Colonies, as the executing the Epiſcopizing ſcheme would be, ſhould be objected to them.

But if Mr *Walpole* ſaw his Grace's weakneſs in this reflection, much more would he be ſcandalized when, to take off all his apprehenſions of what might happen in parliament, he found his Grace intimating, that "there ſeemed no neceſſity that this affair ſhould ever come into parliament."(y)

By this circumſtance, the ſtatesman would diſcover the man and his communication, and whence he derived his principles. He would recollect too, that parliament had more than once taken a retroſpect of miniſterial meaſures, adopted without its ſanction, and would never be more likely to do it, than when ſuch meaſures ſeemed to tend to raiſe feuds and animoſities, diſguſt and diſcontent, in places where the commercial intereſts of *Great Britain* are ſo much concerned, as in the Colonies. And if, in the progreſs of their inquiries, it ſhould appear, that the Adminiſtration had been preſſed into this ſervice by the importunity of the Biſhops in general (who have all been, according to his Grace, equally deſirous of eſtabliſhing Epiſcopacy in the Colonies, from the Revolution, to the date of

(y) Page 21.

of his Letter) few would wonder, if it should be resolved, that "Episcopal power is a great grie-"vance to this nation, and that it must rise to an "equal height wherever Bishops are."

His Grace, however, could put Mr *Walpole* in the way of composing these first even in parliament. "The Administration," says his Grace, "will "easily *quiet* such of the Members as are their "friends;" namely, by threatning to take away their places or their pensions, or by promising them to such of their friends as had them not. "The Tories must be for Bishops, if it be only to "preserve their own credit." And consequently, for Bishops invested with all the powers which tory principles ascribe as appendages to the office: for it would be impossible to keep their credit with their party, by consenting to the sending out Bishops with that limited, low-church jurisdiction, which his Grace *affects* only to desire. "And the "remainder will probably find themselves too in-"considerable to stir." *The remainder*, that is to say, all the faithful representatives of the people, who are neither to be corrupted by the administration, nor infected by those pernicious principles of religion and government, which have been in times past so pernicious to the rights and liberties of the British subject, and so dangerous to that illustrious succession of protestant Princes, under whose Government only we can hope to enjoy them. Excellent Patriot! excellent Archpastor of a free

a free Protestant people, who for the sake of magnifying a mere Ecclesiastical Office, no way essential to the faith or practice of Evangelical Christianity, would stifle the influence, on which the preservation of the religion and liberties of his country chiefly depends.

It remains to consider the only danger, which, according to his Grace, "is left, viz. that of "alarming or provoking the body of the Dissenters (z)." Whom he distinguishes into "a few busy, warm men;" and such as, "after arguing properly with them, have owned that they "had little or nothing to object against appointing Bishops in Plantations of the Episcopal Communion (a)." And among the latter he names Dr *Avery*, and Dr *Samuel Chandler*.

What Dr *Chandler* might say to Dr *Secker*, is of little consequence: It can hardly be said, that Dr *Chandler* spoke the sense of the body of the Dissenters, when it is so well known, that his connexion with that Prelate was far from adding to his estimation among them. He is not at present at hand to answer for himself. Possibly somebody might be found, who is able to answer for him. Be that as it may, I shall not presume either to accuse him, or to apologize for him.

Dr *Avery*'s justification is upon a less precarious footing. It is well known to some yet living, that he was a principal mover of the application to the Ministry,

(z) Page 22. (a) Ibid.

Miniſtry, about the time this Letter of Dr *Secker's* was written, to lay aſide the project of ſending Biſhops to *America*. If I am not miſinformed, he had the honour of conferring with ſome of his Majeſty's Miniſters on the ſubject, and gave them unanſwerable reaſons, why a ſcheme ſo likely to produce diſturbances in the Colonies, ſhould be laid aſide. What he is here repreſented to have acknowledged to the Archbiſhop, is in the higheſt degree improbable. He was not a man to be overawed by the ſolemnity, or cajoled by the affected civility of an Archbiſhop. He was liberal in his ſentiments, and generouſly open and unreſerved in expreſſing them upon all proper occaſions. His conduct, in all his tranſactions, was inflexibly upright, and far exalted above all narrow, ſelfiſh, and ſiniſter views. No man knew all this better than the late Archbiſhop *Secker*; and if this Letter is not ſpurious, it is not an impoſſible ſuppoſition, that *one* motive of its ſleeping ſo long in his Grace's cloſet, might be, the danger of having it croſs-examined and confronted by the teſtimony of ſo reſpectable a character.

Speaking of the oppoſition to this Epiſcopizing project, which might be apprehended from the body of Diſſenters, his Grace delivers himſelf as follows.

" And indeed there is no modeſty in ſaying, " we, who are not of the Eſtabliſhed Church, de- " mand as a matter of ſtrict juſtice, the full ex-

" erciſe

exercise of our religion here, but at the same time insist that the King's episcopal subjects in *America*, with whom we have nothing at all to do, shall not, even in those provinces where they are the established Church, have the full exercise of theirs (*b*).

It is pleasant enough to hear his Grace talk of *modesty*, while he is giving such a representation as this. What would his Grace have thought of his having the full exercise of his religion, in case he had not been permitted to enjoy the preferments he once held in commendam, without first receiving the communion amongst the Dissenters? It is made a part of his merit in the Biographia Britannica that he never did communicate with them, even while he appeared to belong to their Church (*c*) whence it may easily be conjectured, how unpalatable such a condition would have been to him when he was Bishop of *Oxford*. Would not his Lordship have thought, that his Majesty's subjects in *America*, while not burdened with any such test, would have had a fuller exercise of their religion, than his Lordship, even without the ceremony of confirmation? Can a Man be said to have the full exercise of his religion, who is excluded from the natural and equitable rights of a good subject, unless he will conform to a mode of religious worship which he thinks to be wrong, and which some of his brethren have thought to be even *idolatrous*?

(*b*) Page 23. (*c*) Article BUTLER (JOSEPH).

It is plain, his Grace never made this caſe of the Diſſenters his own, and that he gave Mr *Walpole* only a copy of his countenance, when he told him a little below, that, "he ſhould have been a moſt "hearty and zealous advocate for the Diſſenters," in a caſe where they happened not to want his aſſiſtance, and that, "from his love of religious liber-"ty (*d*);" when he never moved a finger to relieve them in a caſe where, if he knew what religious liberty meant, he muſt have known how *juſtly* they think they have it not, and where an advocate of his Grace's ſtation and character would have been of the greateſt ſervice.

There are in this ſhort period, no leſs than two other miſrepreſentations. For, 1. His Grace could not produce any legal authority for ſaying, that the Epiſcopal Church of *England*, is the *eſtabliſhed* Church, in *any* of the American Provinces. 2. The King's Epiſcopal ſubjects in *America*, were not they, with whom our domeſtic Diſſenters, had to do in this caſe. It was their concern for, and their deſire to preſerve to the Americans of their own Antiepiſcopal perſuaſion, the *full exerciſe of their civil and religious rights*, (which they apprehended upon good grounds, might be encroached upon, by the admiſſion of Biſhops into any of the American Provinces) that occaſioned their vigilance at the time referred to. They knew the hardſhip of thoſe legal diſabilities under which they themſelves lay

(*d*) Page 23.

lay at home. They had good reaſon to believe that the influence of the eſtabliſhed Hierarchy contributed to continue this grievance. Their Brethren in *America* were as yet free from it, and if Biſhops were let in among them, and particularly, under the notion of preſiding in *eſtabliſhed* Epiſcopal Churches, there was the higheſt probability, they would take their precedents of Government and Diſcipline from the Eſtabliſhment in the Mother Country, and would probably never be at reſt, till they had eſtabliſhed it on the baſis of an excluſive Teſt. They knew their American brethren thought on this ſubject, juſt as they themſelves did. They knew how *cautiouſly* the projectors of the plan covered their march from all the Colonies, but their own confidants. They knew that, without their interpoſition, the arrival of a Biſhop in *America* would probably be the firſt notice the Coloniſts would have of his appointment at home. They were aware of the alarm this would give them, and of the diſagreeable conſequences of their oppoſition, with reſpect to the Government. They wiſely therefore, and like good patriots, ſignified their apprehenſions to the Government, and ſtrengthened them with ſuch proofs, as entirely convinced the Miniſtry, how much the public peace and welfare depended upon the ſuppreſſion of this pernicious project.

In this tranſaction I have good grounds to ſay, that Dr *Avery* was a principal actor and adviſer;

and would his Grace have ventured, in his life-time, to rank the Dr among "*the few busy, warm men*, who only *affected* to ſpeak in the name of "the whole?" or among thoſe who oppoſed the Epiſcopizing ſcheme through, "a wantonneſs of "ſpirit, or an oſtentatious fondneſs of uſing their "influence with great perſons, to grieve the good "Biſhop of *Oxford* and his partizans, without "ſerving themſelves?" (*e*).

What muſt their Colony-brethren have thought of the Diſſenters at home, had the latter ſuffered them to be taken by ſurprize, and a meaſure forced upon them, to which, if they had not loſt all memory of the firſt migration of their anceſtors from *Old England*, they muſt have the utmoſt averſion? What muſt every diſintereſted Engliſhman have thought of them, if, poſſeſſed as they were of the ſenſe of the Colonies, they ſhould, out of a punctilio of complaiſance to a few ſuch *buſy*, *warm* men as the B—p of *O——d*, have quietly ſuffered a religious war to be kindled in the bowels of *America*, between the Non-epiſcopalians and the Members of the Church of *England*, when they had it in their power to prevent it?

But I ſhall venture to go ſtill farther. Many of the Coloniſts of the Church of *England* are the deſcendants of ſome of the firſt ſettlers, who profeſſed Church principles, and practiſed the modes of worſhip eſtabliſhed in Old *England*, in their own

(*e*) Page 24.

own houſes, when they could not have a Miniſter to officiate among them. Yet theſe were driven from their native land, by Epiſcopal Diſcipline, merely becauſe they could not conform in *every thing*. They left however, their principles and practices to their poſterity, ſome of whom, to this hour, attend the Miniſtry of the Epiſcopal Miſſionaries. But as their fathers left them likewiſe memorials of their own particular ſufferings from Biſhops, they are no more in love with *American* Epiſcopacy than their anceſtors were with *Engliſh* Prelacy. To ſome of theſe, the idea of a Biſhop upon the ſpot, was as diſguſting as to the Nonconformiſts themſelves, and it is now well known, that when they were ſolicited to join ſome others in repreſenting to the Society how much Biſhops were wanted in the Colonies, their anſwer was, "that they were well ſatisfied with the means "they had of worſhipping God according to the "Liturgy, nor did they deſire any thing more."

Among other uneaſineſſes apprehended by Mr *Walpole*, as the probable effect of appointing *American* Biſhops, one was, "that ſuch a meaſure would produce declamations in Pulpits; "and revive the diſtinction of High and Low "among Churchmen (*f*)."

To this anxiety, his Grace adminiſters the following ſoporific. "Now amongſt the Clergy, I "conceive it can make no diſpute, for *every Man*

(*f*) Page 20.

" *of character* amongſt them doth, and muſt wiſh " it ſucceſs." His Grace ſhould have added, " and every man amongſt them who wiſhes it ſucceſs, is and muſt be a *Man of character*;" and then the reſult muſt have been, that every one who did not wiſh the project to ſucceed, was reprobate, *a Man of* no *character*.

But might not Mr *Walpole* have ſuggeſted, that diſputes were moſt likely to be raiſed by Men of *no* character? His Grace was free enough to confeſs, that, " if the project were brought upon the carpet, and the adminiſtration were to oppoſe it, " ſome Clergymen (*ſome of theſe Men of character*) " might be tempted to ſay indecent things of " them;" and I pray, how much leſs ſcrupulous may we ſuppoſe Men of *no* character, who ſhould not wiſh the project ſucceſs, would have been, in caſe the adminiſtration had eſpouſed it? Either way then, we ſee declamations from the pulpit, and diſputes between Clergymen *of character*, and Clergymen *of no character*, would have been unavoidable, had the affair come upon the carpet. The beſt way therefore, Mr *Walpole* would think, would be to keep it off the carpet.

But would this have ſatisfied theſe Clergymen *of character*, with his Grace at their head? Let us hear his Grace upon this queſtion. " We indeed " do not threaten, if we are diſregarded. But they " [the Diſſenters] have no more right to threaten " than we: nor need they be feared if they do.

" Their

"Their threatnings have been very safely slighted, "on a point which they have much more at heart, "than the Test: and so they may in this (g)."

"It is, I think, pretty certain, (if we may credit "some other parts of this Grace's Letter) that the "Clergy *of character*, particularly the Bishops, never ceased to desire, and we must suppose, to endeavour, that Bishops should be established in *America*, from the revolution to the day of the date of his Letter to Mr *Walpole*. During this whole interval, these desires have been so far *disregarded*, that in his Grace's language, the affair never came *upon the carpet*. If it should, and the administration were to oppose it, "some of those Clergymen "of character, who wish it success, might, in his "Grace's opinion, be tempted to say indecent "things of them."

Now, in my ideas, this has something the air of a threat, in case the administration should not behave as these clergymen *of character* would have them.

However his Grace would have it believed, that mere *disregard*, even for so long a time as sixty years, had not produced the least murmur, that could be called a *menace*. But where are the mortals whose patience, after so long an interval, may not be worn out? How far this was the case, with the Bishop of *Oxford* at least, in the year 1750, we shall see presently.

"In

(g) Page 25.

In the mean time, it muſt be a pleaſant conſideration to Mr *Walpole*, that the prejudices of the Jacobites and the Tories againſt the King and his miniſtry, might be allayed by appointing Biſhops for *America*, as his Grace ſuggeſts (*h*), adding that, "till theſe people are reconciled, our domeſ-"tic affairs will never be on a firm and eaſy foot-"ing." Indeed he gives Mr *Walpole* no great encouragement to hope that *ſuch inſtances of kind-"neſs*, would work any great or ſpeedy reformation among them, "but," ſays his Grace, "ſome "good effect they muſt produce; and perſeve-"rance in a due regimen will at length compleat "the cure (*i*)."

Which expedient would not be unhappily hit off, but for one objection on the part of the friends of his Majeſty and his Government. For as this *American* Epiſcopacy ſeems to have been, in his Grace's ideas, one principal ingredient in that *due regimen* which was to compleat the cure of Jacobitiſm and Toryiſm, a *perſeverance* in the adminiſtration of it, might ſuggeſt the neceſſity of increaſing the doſe from time to time, till it ſhould be totally modelled, not only to the taſte, but to the conſtitution of the patients, *i. e.* till it came to be a perfectly *Eaudæan* Epiſcopacy; which would be *an inſtance of kindneſs* to theſe prejudiced people, to which, though it might be to his Grace's palate, the

(*h*) Page 25. (*i*) Page 26.

the friends to the Proteſtant ſettlement, would, no doubt, have conſiderable objections.

Thus far by way of friendly *innuendo*, of what might happen in caſe of a refuſal. In what follows, his Grace ſpeaks a little plainer.

"On the other hand," ſays his Grace, "I apprehend, the rejection of this propoſal will do "the Government by far more hurt amongſt the "Churchmen, than it can poſſibly do them good "amongſt the Diſſenters. When *the Biſhops* are "aſked about it, as they frequently are by their "Clergy and others, what muſt they anſwer? "We cannot with truth expreſs diſapprobation of "it, or indifference to it. If we did, we ſhould "be thought unworthy of our ſtations. Muſt "we then be forced to ſay, that we are all ſatisfied of the abſolute fitneſs, the great advantages, "the perfect ſafety of the thing, and have repeatedly preſſed for it; but cannot prevail? "Would not this both ſadly diminiſh our ability "of ſerving the Government, by ſhewing how "little credit we have with it; and make very "undeſireable impreſſions on many minds, *concerning the King*, and thoſe that are in authority "under him; as incapable of being won by the "arguments or intreaties of thoſe, who have ſo "ſtrong a zeal for them, to do *an innocent favour* "to the Church? Still, if we cannot ſucceed by "reſpectful applications, I know it is our duty to "make the beſt of the matter, and not diſturb

"the

" the public welfare, becauſe, in this particular,
" we are unable to promote it. *I would ſpeak to*
" *gently of the affair as ever I could, where there*
" *was danger of doing harm; though I ſpeak ſo ear-*
" *neſtly, where I would fain hope to do good. But*
" *no mildneſs or prudence will wholly or nearly pre-*
" *vent the abovementioned conſequences* (*k*)."

And what are the abovementioned conſequences? Even as much hurt to Government as can ariſe, on the one hand, from a diminution of the credit of the Biſhops, and conſequently of their ability of ſerving the Government; and on the other, from the reſentment of the Clergy, on the diſappointment of a project on which *all* of them, *of any character*, have ſet their hearts. And as his Grace apprehends, that this will do the government more hurt than any good the rejection of it will do them among the Diſſenters can make amends for, we muſt conclude that it would be at the peril of the Government to oblige the one and diſoblige the other.

" We do not threaten, ſays his Grace, when
" we are diſregarded."—" Why no, my Lord,"
might Mr *Walpole* have anſwered, " not in the
" terms of a *Covent-Garden* bully, your Lordſhip
" only gives us *civilly* to underſtand, what a neſt
" of waſps your *epiſcopal repreſentations* can raiſe
" about our ears, if we do not behave like good
" boys; and how much leſs formidable the threat-
" nings of the Diſſenters would be, than the *gentle*,
" *mild*,

(*k*) Page 26, 27.

mild, and *prudent* remonſtrances of our own ſpiritual fathers, with a numerous clergy at their back."

Did the Diſſenters, when ſoliciting the repeal of the Teſt act, carry their menaces farther than this? So his Grace thought fit to tell Mr *Walpole*, reminding him at the ſame time, that their threatnings, on that occaſion, had been very lately ſlighted (*l*).

I am afraid, Mr *Walpole* would be inclined to queſtion the truth of this repreſentation; and probably, had he thought his Grace's Letter worth his notice, would have told him, that the application of the Diſſenters to have the Teſt repealed, ſo far as it related to his Majeſty's Proteſtant ſubjects, was *not* ſlighted. The anſwers given them were reſpectful, and they dutifully acquieſced in the reaſons that were aſſigned, why their requeſt could not be complied with. This is meant of the Body of the Diſſenters, which, as his Grace has well obſerved, is not to be denominated from *a few buſy, warm men among them*.

It is upon record, that the wiſe and good King *William*, was deſirous to oblige the Diſſenters in this point, without any particular application from them. It is equally well known, that the two excellent Princes, GEORGE I. and GEORGE II. were no leſs diſpoſed to comply with the ſeveral applications made on that behalf by the Diſſenters; and ſuch likewiſe were the ſentiments of Mr *Walpole* and his

(*l*) Page 25.

his noble brother; and ſuch will ever be the ſentiments of all true Patriots, and well wiſhers to the Proteſtant religion, and the Proteſtant government of this country.

There were indeed *threatnings* on thoſe occaſions, which were *not* ſlighted, *threatnings* from the high-church party, many of them, in ſubſtance, though not exactly in ſtile, the ſame with theſe *gentle* and *friendly admonitions* of the Biſhop of *Oxford*. Theſe made *due impreſſions* upon the ſtatesmen of thoſe days, whoſe experience had taught them, that it was ſafer to ſlight the threatnings of any ſort of men, rather than thoſe of an incenſed and vindictive high-church clergy. Very few who either remember the tranſactions of thoſe times, or have read the hiſtory of them, will think, that theſe latter threatnings had a leſs ſhare in ſupporting the Teſt, than either the expediency of the law or a mere contempt for the Diſſenters.

I have now gone through his Grace's Letter to Mr *Walpole*, on the ſubject of *American* Biſhops: and the remaining queſtion is only this, Whether his Grace was capable of writing a Letter ſo full of groſs miſtakes, inconſiſtencies, artful miſrepreſentations, and unmanly calumnies, to a Statesman, who, from the nature of his ſituation, was ſo capable of detecting and confuting them. The alternative is obvious. If the Letter is ſpurious, the *forgers* of it are unpardonable, not only on account of a baſe impoſition upon the public, but

for

for traducing the memory of a great man, who departed ſo lately full of days and honour, and in the odour of ſanctity. If the Letter is genuine, his Encomiaſts muſt have been egregiouſly miſtaken, who have aſcribed to him, not only eminent abilities in the province of authorſhip, but an uncommon meaſure of judgment, candour, moderation, and integrity in the adminiſtration of his high office; virtues and endowments, which the writer of ſuch a Letter muſt have poſſeſſed in a very moderate degree.

The whole caſe is now before the public; and if any one ſhould be inclined to think that his Grace hath been treated in theſe papers with more freedom than is conſiſtent with a decent regard to his Grace's ſtation and character; let it be conſidered, that if this Letter is a forgery, theſe Remarks upon it are a full juſtification of his Grace from the imputations which are neceſſarily ſuggeſted by the contents of it. If it is genuine, be it underſtood, that *Truth* and *Righteouſneſs* are no reſpecters of perſons, are of no party, nor at all more attached to the Mitre and Lawn, than to the Sackcloth and Aſhes of a pretended penitent. And be it farther noticed, that he who contrives to ſpread bad principles, and to recommend miſchievous projects after his demiſe, which he does not chuſe to publiſh and avow in his life-time, is no longer intitled to the benefit of that common maxim, *De mortuis nil niſi bonum.*

POSTSCRIPT.

POSTSCRIPT.

THAT it may not be ſaid that mere prejudice hath prevailed ſo far in drawing up theſe Remarks, as to leave no room for juſtice; I here declare my entire concurrence with his Grace in one maxim adopted by him, at page 6. however unfortunate I may think him in his application of it to the promotion of *American* Epiſcopacy.

The maxim is this. *Againſt things evidently right and uſeful, no dangers ought to be pleaded, but ſuch as are very probable and great.* His Grace ſaw the *rectitude* and *uſefulneſs* of ſettling Biſhops in our American Colonies in ſo ſtrong a point of light, and the *dangers* which would attend it, at ſo great a diſtance, and in ſo diminutive a ſize, that he ventured this aphoriſm with all ſecurity; nothing doubting, but the public would readily take his word for *one* member of his premiſſes, as a conſummate Divine, and for the other, as a Prelate

POSTSCRIPT.

THAT it may not be ſaid that mere prejudice hath prevailed ſo far in drawing up theſe Remarks, as to leave no room for juſtice; I here declare my entire concurrence with his Grace in one maxim adopted by him, at page 6. however unfortunate I may think him in his application of it to the promotion of *American* Epiſcopacy.

The maxim is this. *Againſt things evidently right and uſeful, no dangers ought to be pleaded, but ſuch as are very probable and great.* His Grace ſaw the *rectitude* and *uſefulneſs* of ſettling Biſhops in our American Colonies in ſo ſtrong a point of light, and the *dangers* which would attend it, at ſo great a diſtance, and in ſo diminutive a ſize, that he ventured this aphoriſm with all ſecurity, nothing doubting, but the public would readily take his word for *one* member of his premiſſes, as a conſummate Divine, and for the other, as a Prelate

Prelate of great *moderation* and *ſincerity*, which would intitle him to his concluſion of courſe.

There were however times and occaſions, when and where this maxim made very little impreſſion upon his Grace, and when and where the application of it, in the opinion of many ſerious and thinking Chriſtians, was full as appoſite, as it was in the caſe of *American* Biſhops.

It is well known, that ſeveral very important objections have been made to ſome particulars in our eſtabliſhed forms; that alterations and amendments in theſe have been ſuggeſted by learned and conſcientious men, both among the clergy and the laity; and that they who have ſolicited ſuch amendments, have demonſtrated, to the ſatisfaction of all capable and diſintereſted judges, that ſuch amendments would be not only *right* and *uſeful*, but *void of all danger*, except from the oppoſition of thoſe, who ought to be the firſt to promote them.

How ſtood his Grace affected to theſe alterations and amendments? Even juſt as his Grace, in this Letter, repreſents the Diſſenters at home, and the Non-conforming Coloniſts abroad, to be affected towards his project of epiſcopizing *America*, *warm* and *buſy* and *zealous* to diſappoint every thing tending to encourage them, and *threatning* the public with dolorous conſequences, if any of the ſeveral reformations propoſed, ſhould take place.

For

For this purpoſe his Grace's agents were ſet to work in every quarter, and having once more revived the ridiculous clamour of the *danger* of the Church, they were not aſhamed to repreſent the remonſtrants on the behalf of a reformation, as aiming to root up the foundations of the eſtabliſhment; as, *ſeeking, under the pretence of amendment, to break looſe from all inſtitutions and forms*; as propoſing to *ſet fire to the whole edifice, becauſe ſome minute parts of it are not perfectly adapted to the reſt*; and laſtly, as *concurring with thoſe ſons of licentiouſneſs, who think that laws are ſuperfluous things, and that civil ſocieties were inſtituted to be torn to pieces by diſcords* (*a*).

Dr *Markham*, Dean of *Chriſt's Church*, of whoſe oratory this is a ſpecimen, could hardly be unconſcious that he had here employed the figure *Hyperbole* with great freedom. But he would take it for granted his audience would underſtand him, and particularly *one* of them, who had already appriſed the world how much *utility*, in caſes of this nature, had the advantage of *truth*.

It was honeſt enough in him, however, to tell the company firſt, and afterwards ſo many of his readers as underſtand Latin, where he learned his knack. For he immediately ſubjoins, that, "it "was hardly poſſible for him, or any one elſe to "deal in ſuch matters, without calling to mind

(*a*) See Dr Markham's *Oratiuncula*, at the end of his *Concio ad Clerum*, before the Convocation, *Jan.* 25. 1769.

"*that man*, who among our Prelates had obtained "the *ſovereignty*, and by whoſe death we grieve "for the *diminiſhed dignity* of our Church." A pretty compliment, by the way, to the ſurvivors; to which, leſt he ſhould not be underſtood, he adds a little afterwards, "the Church would have a "great loſs of ſuch a man in her moſt flouriſhing "times, but much more in her preſent *penury!*"

What effect this petulant inſult might have upon the venerable body to which it was addreſſed, I ſhall not preſume to gueſs; but I confeſs, when I recollect, even without looking into the Court calendar, ten or a dozen names who were either *actually* or *virtually* preſent on that occaſion, and who are far from being overvalued in point of abilities, by being put in compariſon with the late Archbiſhop *Secker*, my reſentment is provoked, and I am unavoidably urged to examine upon what grounds this unjuſt preference is given to the Orator's Hero and grand Exemplar.

"He was, ſaith Dr *Markham*, a ſtrenuous "[*propugnator*] both of *our* faith and diſcipline." Our faith and diſcipline; that is, the faith and diſcipline of the Church of *England*. The idea of a Gladiator, is not quite ſo ſuitable to the character of a defender of the chriſtian faith and diſcipline: and the plain meaning of this encomium is, that this Grace was an obſtinate maintainer of whatſoever was *eſtabliſhed*, right or wrong; whether agreeable to the Goſpel of Chriſt, or not.

However,

However, to make his Grace look as like a good christian and a good protestant as he could, he hath added, *ubique tamen sine acerbitate dissentiens*; which I know not well how to render, as, a *strenuous champion* dissenting from his adversary *without bitterness*, exhibits a discordancy in one and the same character, not very easy to be conceived: unless we may be allowed to suppose that his Grace's *propugnatorial* spirit, was glossed over with an insidious mildness, by way of a mask, till he could take his adversary at a proper advantage. For if his Grace's mildness and moderation, were either truly natural, or truly christian dispositions, it is impossible Dr *Markham* should be put in mind of Archbishop *Sicker*, in the midst of the *bitterest* railings, misrepresentations, and even scurrilities, thrown out against those who attempted only to *reform* his Grace's beloved establishment of faith and discipline.

Having done with his Grace's controversial character, Dr *Markham* proceeds to give an account of his literary abilities, where, having allowed that, "his Grace's stile was not the most polished," he insists, that, "no one ever outstripped him, in copiousness, method, and gravity." Did the Doctor never hear of *Thomas Aquinas*? However, these are excellencies it must be owned; but excellencies of which every laborious compiler of a good common-place book may equally boast.

This *mediocrity* in his Grace's proficiency as a writer, is the more ſurprizing, in that we are told, at the end of the next paragraph, that, "there "never was a man of leiſure who laboured more "in literary ſtudies, than his Grace did in a moſt "buſy ſtation."

As Dr *Markham*, no doubt, expects to be believed, we will for once, take his word for this remarkable fact, and only inquire how his Grace acquitted himſelf in his department of *buſineſs*.

And here his Grace is held forth to us, as, "a "*Magiſtrate*, who laid it down for a principal "rule of his conduct, to be wanting to no part "of his duty, and this in the midſt of a multi-"plicity of cares with which he was daily beſet."

I freely acknowledge that I cannot form an idea of a *Magiſtrate* in the Church of Chriſt, without adding to it the idea of *uſurpation*. In the Church of *Antichriſt*, a *Magiſtrate* is a neceſſary character. *His* repreſentative muſt, from the nature of his truſt, be inveſted with compulſive powers, equipped with an inquiſition, and other means of inflicting pains and penalties upon thoſe who diſſent from his particular ſyſtem.

It is not for the honour of Archbiſhop *Secker* to ſuppoſe that he affected *Magiſtracy* in the leaſt degree; much leſs, that, in the exerciſe of ſuch office, he *was wanting to no part of it*; as that muſt imply a deſire at leaſt to execute penal Laws againſt

againſt Heretics and Schiſmatics, to incapacitate Diſſenters, by impoſing upon them Teſts and Subſcriptions to points of his own deviſing, and never to ſuffer one of them to eſcape his vigilance when he could lay hold of him.

There is, I think, but one reaſon why the Archbiſhop ſhould deſire to be inveſted with the powers of *Magiſtracy*. He had but poor luck in the province of *Church-champion*. He was generally worſted whenever he met his adverſary upon the plain field of Controverſy, whether he choſe to engage on Engliſh ground, or went in queſt of adventures to a foreign land. At home, his own artillery was dextrouſly turned upon him (*b*). Abroad, his Ligurian arts and ſubterfuges were completely defeated, merely by the dint of an honeſt heart, a good cauſe, and a ſkilful hand (*c*). It is true in theſe conflicts, his Grace laid aſide the *inſignia* of his order, but ſome how or other, the adverſary got a peep at his countenance through the chinks of his viſor, and after that, there was

(*b*) In a ſpirited and ingenious pamphlet, intided, *Remarks upon the Firſt of three Letters againſt* The Confeſſional, *p.* 24—36. *N. B.* The *Second* and *Third* of theſe Letters are *not* the Archbiſhop's, but the work of an every way inferior hand.

(*c*) See *Remarks on an anonymous Tract, intitled*, An Anſwer to Dr *Mayhew*'s Obſervations on the Charter and Conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Goſpel in foreign Parts. By *Jonathan Mayhew*, Paſtor of the *Weſtchurch* in *Boſton*. London, Reprinted for *W. Nicoll*, 1765.

no avoiding the diſgrace of being vanquiſhed by caitiff knights of low degree.

It is no wonder that repeated mortifications of this kind ſhould raiſe a little aſpiration in the breaſt of an impatient Prelate, to an office in which he might take his amends with more advantage. How far he acted, on this conſideration, in the character of a *Church-magiſtrate*, Dr MARKHAM may know better than I do. But whatever his Grace's diligence and vigilance were in this department, it is plain, if we may believe Dr *Markham*, he had very little ſucceſs; for the Dr tells us, not without ſome ſeeming regret, that, "there never was a time when men lived and "thought more according to their own judg-"ment." Whereas, if things had proceeded proſperouſly on the *Magiſtratical* plan of faith and diſcipline, men ought to have lived and thought according to the judgment of Archbiſhop *Secker* and Dr *Markham*.

The Doctor concludes his panegyric (which he modeſtly acknowledges to be *ſhort* and *jejune*) with the following flouriſh of his art. "In ſome men "we diſcern an excellent genius, and a multipli-"city of ſcience, in others, prudence, authority, "probity, conſtancy; but we ſhall not eaſily find "one in whom all theſe have ſo abundantly met "together."

I have no inclination to diſſect this complication of excellencies; let every one judge of it as he

ſees

ſees cauſe. I allow, on the one hand, that an exalted ſtation is a great *brightener*, and on the other, that an *Oxford* Orator may be indulged in a little fiction; but his Grace's writings are *ſerious* things, and are a juſt *criterion* for any one who is diſpoſed to verify this accumulation of virtues and good qualities, without looking for a parallel either among the living or the dead.

It is as impoſſible for me to mention an *Oxford* Orator without thinking of Dr *Burton* (*d*), as it was for Dr *Markham* to ſcourge the advocates for reformation, without thinking of Archbiſhop *Secker*.

Dr *Burton* takes his Grace up indeed a little late in life, not ſooner than his 28th year; whence our great grandchildren, reading the contents of this panegyric in its *fortieth* edition, will naturally conclude, that his Grace owed his immenſe proficiency in *omni ſcibili* (Phyſick excepted) ſolely to the doctrine and diſciplin of the univerſity of *Oxford*; little dreaming that he received the ſlighteſt rudiments among the "*irritable*, *perverſe*, *malignant*, *ſeditious*, and *intolerably tyrannical* Puritans (*e*)." And yet, as he turned out in the end, ſo *compleatly furniſhed with imperatorial arts* (*f*), it is not at all unnatural to ſuppoſe that he might have picked up

(*d*) JOHANNIS BURTON ad amicum Epiſtola; ſive commentariolus THOMÆ SECKER, Archiep. Cantuar. Memoriæ Sacer. OXONII, E Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1768.

(*e*) Epiſt. p. 27, 28. (*f*) Page 14.

and retained ſome ſlight maxims of Hierarchical diſcipline among theſe *tyrannical* Diſſenters, with whom his early connexions are not yet abſolutely forgotten.

I am ſorry my time will not allow me to go through this elaborate Epiſtle, which furniſhes in every page abundant matter for very edifying reflections, particularly on the frailty of bigoted and injudicious panegyriſts, who, void of every idea of juſtice, moderation, or propriety, where their idol is to be exhibited, give occaſion to thoſe who are not quite ſo prone to credulity, to look farther into a character ſo bedaubed with fulſome adulation, than they might otherwiſe be diſpoſed to do.

Dr *Burton*, for example, holds up his Grace as one of the *princes of Critics* in Hebrew literature, and for this he ſends us to Mr *Merrick*'s Annotation on the Pſalms (*g*). This might paſs well enough with thoſe who took Dr *Burton* for a competent judge, at leaſt for two or three months after the publication of his Epiſtle. But Dr *Gregory Sharpe*, having, after that interval, ſhewn how far his Grace had waded out of his depth in that province, the encomium now ſerves for nothing, but to give ſuſpicions, that there are more of them in the pamphlet, upon equally precarious grounds.

(*g*) Epiſt. page 6.

grounds (*b*). Add to this, that ſome ſuſpicions having been raiſed by the freedom of his Grace's ſpeculations on revealed religion in the earlier part of his life, nothing could be more injudicious than to attempt to embelliſh his Grace's character, by ſending the reader to a few inſipid cavils againſt ſome ſtriking parts of a very learned and able *Defence of* CHRISTIANITY (*i*).

Again, it was objected to his Grace, that he was out of meaſure provoked at every attempt to amend or reform our Eccleſiaſtical ſyſtem in thoſe particulars where it is moſt exceptionable: that whenever ſuch propoſals appeared, he was out of all patience, ſummoning his Myrmidons from every quarter, and oftentimes lending his own hand to the confutation of theſe *Innovators* and *Schiſmatics*. This, numbers of his Grace's admirers would never believe, ſuppoſing that his Grace, who had profited ſo much by his own *free examination*, could not be ſo violently embittered himſelf, or afford his patronage and countenance to thoſe who were, againſt men who had an equal right to judge for themſelves. But Dr *Burton* ſoon put the matter out of doubt, by acknowledging

(*b*) *Vid.* A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of *Oxford*, from the Maſter of the *Temple*, containing ſome Strictures made by his Grace the late Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, in the Reverend Mr *Merrick*'s Annotations on the Pſalms. *London*, 1769.

(*i*) See the *Remarks* cited above, Note (*b*) p. 87.

knowledging in one place, his Grace for the author of the feeble *Anſwer* to Dr *Mayhew* (*k*), and, in another, by divulging, that his Grace not only undertook the office of *propugnator* himſelf, againſt the *ſlanders* of *Schiſmatics* and *Innovators*, but uſed the *vicarious* aſſiſtance of others who fought under his ſtandard (*l*).

It is true, the Dr ſays, he took the ſame courſe with the calumnies of the papiſts. It might be ſo; but the evidence *here* is a little obſcure: in the other caſe it is clear and deciſive.

It has been often aſſerted, and as often denied, that his Grace kept a record of clerical delinquents, commonly called a *black book*, in which were regiſtred the names and offences of thoſe who had the misfortune to fall under his Grace's diſpleaſure; and that the better to detect defaulters, his Grace had his ſpies and emiſſaries properly diſtributed to give the neceſſary information —Dr *Burton* ſeems to give credit to the affirmative, by aſſuring us, that his Grace, "animadverted upon every thing relating to the Clergy; that he had his *internuntii*, "and uſed the miniſtry of others in his diſquiſitions; ſought out and noted every thing; and "finally, *digeſted his diſcoveries into a kind of Faſti*, "by way of a provincial hiſtory, for the uſe of his "ſucceſſors (*m*)." It would be ſtrange if there ſhould

(*k*) Epiſt. page 28. (*l*) Ibid. p. 21.
(*m*) Page 25.

ſhould not be one column of this calendar appropriated to the *carbone notandi*.

But our greateſt obligations to Dr *Burton* ariſe from his candid and undiſguiſed account of the motives of his Grace's zeal for *American* Epiſcopacy. His Grace, it ſeems, underſtood by his books, that Epiſcopal government was of apoſtolical original: He perceived likewiſe [how, it is not ſaid, perhaps by *inſtinct*] that there was a kindred connexion between *Epiſcopacy* and *Monarchy*. (*n*) And with theſe convictions upon his mind, "what wonder, ſaith Dr *Burton*, that our Archprelate ſhould favour the pious deſires of thoſe "Americans, who having embraced the faith "and diſcipline of the Church of *England*, coveted to have epiſcopal adminiſtrations more within their reach?" This was kind and compaſſionate!

But the misfortune is, that the poſthumous publication of his Grace's Letter to Mr *Walpole*, hath made it queſtionable, whether theſe motives did not work conſiderably towards their effect, *without* theſe *pious deſires*, and long before his Grace was poſſeſſed of the Archprelacy. That Dr *Burton* was well acquainted with his Grace's *motives* for promoting Epiſcopal government in *America*, there can be no doubt, after his contracted of friendſhip with his Grace, for more than forty years (*o*). But ſome poſſibly may ſuſpect, that the

(*n*) Page 26. (*o*) Page 4.

the Dr knew little more of their *operation* than merely the *oſtenſible* parts of it.

And yet from his aſſigning, or at leaſt intimating a *third* motive for his Grace's zeal in this American buſineſs, I am apt to think Dr *Burton* knew more of this matter than he thought fit to divulge.

It ſeems our domeſtic Diſſenters, forming their judgment upon Dr *Secker's* gentleneſs and lenity, and his earneſtneſs to ſupport the right of toleration (not without ſome retroſpect, it is likely, to his more early principles and connexions) expected his Grace would at a proper time, "betray to "them the privileges and authority of the Church "of *England* (*p*)."

There was no way ſo effectual to convince them of their miſtake, as to diſcover his ardent zeal to epiſcopize their brethren in *America*. What other methods his Grace might take to undeceive them, it is not material to inquire. According to Dr *Burton*, it muſt have been this circumſtance in his Grace's conduct which chiefly opened their eyes, as it derived upon his Grace their moſt furious reſentment.

This being the caſe, we have here a *third* motive for his Grace's zeal for *American* Epiſcopacy, diſtinct from *Apoſtolical* and *Monarchical* relations, inducing a ſuſpicion, that the *impious averſion* of *ſome* to *American* Epiſcopacy, might have as great a ſhare

(*p*) Page 27.

a ſhare in his Grace's attempts to eſtabliſh it, as the *pious deſires* of *others*.

If it were worth the while, one might pick out abundant matter of amuſement, from a compariſon of Dr *Burton*'s Elogy with that of Dr *Markham*'s. Both of them ſeem to have been conſcious, that the tranſmitting the moſt unexceptionable characters to poſterity, without ſome alloy of human infirmity, hath given occaſion to the inquiſitive reader oftentimes to queſtion the good faith of the hiſtorian, or the ſincerity of the panegyriſt. They ſeem however not to be agreed, where the *naevi* in Archbiſhop *Secker*'s portrait ſhould be inſerted.

Dr *Markham* is inclined to place the chief imperfection in his Grace's ſtile. But this Dr *Burton* cannot be ſuppoſed to allow; having ſubmitted his own valuable labours to his Grace's poliſhing hand, which, according to the Dr, performed this office with the utmoſt accuracy (*q*).

Dr *Markham*, again, thinks, that, "the chief duty of *Magiſtracy*, is to apply, "with diligence "to the ordering thoſe buſineſſes which occur in "the daily courſe of things;" and in this article, the Dr affirms, that the Archbiſhop, "in the "multiplicity of cares with which he was diſ-"tracted, neglected nothing."

But Dr *Burton* is of another opinion; he *requires* in a Magiſtrate *an imperious obſtinacy and arrogance*, in which, according to him, his Grace was extremely

(*q*) Epiſt. page 30.

tremely defective; and informs us, that, had his Grace exerciſed his authority to the full, and not given way to the times, he would have much more effectually provided for the common good. "For "had this *Prince of Eccleſiaſtics* exerted himſelf, "he might, according to Dr *Burton*, (in con-"junction with his Majeſty, both of them acting "as the avengers and ſatellites of deſpiſed and "violated Religion) have totally defeated that "hundred-headed beaſt, *Impiety*, which paraded "with impunity among almoſt all ranks of men." And he gives us no obſcure intimations, that had he been in his Grace's ſeat, matters would have gone much better; that is to ſay, "Authority "would have been reſtored to the Laws, its pro-"per honour to piety, reverence to the Eccleſiaſ-"tical order, *nor, perhaps, would the* Americans "*have been deprived of an Hierarchy* (*r*)." Such is the courage and ſpirit of thoſe who breathe *the atmoſphere of wholeſome ſeverities!*

This *lenity* it is, that Dr *Burton* exhibits as the late Archbiſhop's grand foible; taking care however to inform us, that, "it was not ſo much the "effect of the *ſentiments* or the *will* of the man, "as of a certain *political neceſſity* of the times (*s*)." In which, I am apt to believe, few people who knew his Grace, will diſagree with him.

Such are the encomiums of the Doctors, *Burton* and *Markham*, who, by their officious interpoſition,

(*r*) Epiſt. page 35, 36. (*s*) Page 36.

position, may be fairly said to have left their Hero in a much worse condition than they found him, and (to borrow an expression from the celebrated *Junius*) to have injured him by their assistance.

On this charge of *vanity*, however, I am of opinion, a willing advocate might find something to say for his Grace. There certainly were times and occasions when he was by no means defective in this *arrogance of Magistracy* required by Dr *Bunton*. And I will only add, that it would be to his Grace's honour, if it could be proved, that, in these instances, he was less influenced by his own temper and principles, than by the counsels and instigation of such men as these adulatory Orators.

FINIS.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM